LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/greatdebateonfin00horrrich

HE

GREAT DEBATE.

BETWEEN

. ROSWELL G. HORR, OF NEW YORK

AND

WILLIAM H. HARVEY, OF ILLINOIS

PUBLISHERS:
DEBATE PUBLISHING COMPANY,
134 Monroe Street, Fort Dearborn Building,
CHICAGO.

SERIES, ISSUED QUARTERLY, $1.00 PER YEAR. VOL. 1, NO. 1.
SEPTEMBER, 1895.

Trade Supplied by The American News Company and its Branches.

THE GREAT DEBATE

ON THE FINANCIAL QUESTION

BETWEEN

HON. ROSWELL G. HORR OF NEW YORK

AND

WILLIAM H. HARVEY OF ILLINOIS

THE SIX CHAPTERS OF "COIN'S FINANCIAL SCHOOL" THE SUBJECT OF THE DEBATE

THE ONLY OFFICIAL AND AUTHORIZED COPY OF THE DEBATE

CHICAGO
DEBATE PUBLISHING COMPANY
134 MONROE STREET

Copyright 1895
BY AZEL F. HATCH
CHICAGO, ILL.

HON. ROSWELL G. HORR.

WILLIAM H. HARVEY.

HG 571
H8

THE GREAT DEBATE.

CHAPTER I.

HOW THE DEBATE CAME ABOUT.

In June, 1894, William H. Harvey of Chicago published a little book entitled "Coin's Financial School," in which various prominent business men and politicians of Chicago were introduced as pupils attending a school opened in the Art Institute by "Coin, a young financier," who taught that the United States mints ought to be re-opened to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The book was discussed generally throughout the United States and was the subject of editorial comment by the newspapers.

Following the public notice attracted by the book, the author, Mr. W. H. Harvey, was invited by a committee of prominent gentlemen in Chicago to meet in joint discussion Hon. Roswell G. Horr of New York, as shown by the accompanying letter and reply thereto.

CHICAGO, MAY 18, 1895.

MR. W. H. HARVEY,
Author of "Coin's Financial School," City.

The undersigned, believing that the usual method of public debate, wherein disputants indulge largely in alternate set speeches, is far from being satisfactory or convincing to the average reader or auditor, and believing further that in a question involving the monetary

M308814

system of the United States, where the interests of all people are so largely concerned, it is important to reach the truth in the most direct and convincing manner, stripped of all romance or rhetoric, do hereby invite you, as one of the most prominent exponents of free coinage ideas in this country, to meet the Hon. Roswell G. Horr, of New York, not upon the public platform, where the excitement of the hour might sway the judgment, but in the quietness and calm of a deliberate discussion, where questions may be put and answers made and all aspects of the subject may be brought forward and carefully considered, and proper authority furnished in support of the same. Said discussion to be based upon the propositions laid down in "Coin's Financial School," the rules governing the same and all the details to be arranged by yourself and Mr. Horr later.

(Signed)

E. S. Dreyer.	Sigmund Zeisler.
Ferd. W. Peck.	E. F. Lawrence.
J. J. P. Odell.	Azel F. Hatch.
Alexander H. Revell.	Chas. Henrotin.
John R. Walsh.	Wm. T. Baker.
E. G. Keith.	E. S. Conway.
Wm. A. Vincent.	Jno. Ela.
L. C. Collins, Jr.	Geo. R. Peck.

Chicago, May 27, 1895.

Messrs. E. S. Dreyer, J. J. P. Odell,
Jno. R. Walsh, and others,
Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen:—I am in receipt of your communication of the 18th inst., which on account of press of business has not heretofore received my attention and careful consideration.

You invite a discussion by your challenge covering the facts laid down in "Coin's Financial School." In view of the fact that the gold-standard press of the country have charged that the cardinal facts stated in "Coin's Financial School" are false, misleading and untrue, and knowing as I do that they are true, it would

probably be of great benefit in the educational campaign now in progress, were this question settled. If the facts in said book are true, and the people should be convinced that they are true, then I have no doubt but it would lead to the conversion of all the people, including yourselves, to the truths of bimetallism and be of great value to this country.

With a view, therefore, to sustaining the facts set forth in said book, and defending it against the charges of falsehood made by the gold-standard press, I consider favorably your challenge for a joint discussion with the Hon. Roswell G. Horr, to take place before a stenographer in the manner which you have indicated, provided rules can be agreed upon that will protect us from misquotation, and where we can read our own proof in print of what we say and the authorities used, before giving it to the public.

And for the purpose of determining whether we can agree upon suitable rules governing us in case said debate takes place, I name Mr. Howard S. Taylor of this city as my next friend and representative to meet such representative as you or Mr. Horr may appoint to consult in regard to the same.

Respectfully, W. H. Harvey.

A few days after the gentlemen above named received Mr. Harvey's reply, Mr. Horr came on from New York and he and Mr. Harvey met in a room at the Palmer House in Chicago, and discussed the arrangements that would govern the debate. Later the conclusions they reached were embodied in written rules, as will more fully appear hereafter, and were signed by them.

The date fixed by the rules for the debate to begin was July 16, 1895, and the place Chicago. The rules provided for the debate to take place in a room or small hall where only a limited number of people would be present, and to be taken down by official stenographers.

It was provided that a verbatim report was to be furnished the press, and that later an official report appear properly bound in book form.

The referees, Mr. Lyman G. Gage, President of the First National Bank of Chicago, representing Mr. Horr, and Mr. Howard S. Taylor, a prominent attorney of the same city, representing Mr. Harvey, selected a committee to have charge of the arrangements connected with the debate. This committee was composed of the following named gentlemen: Henry G. Miller, W. A. Vincent, F. J. Schulte, Howard S. Taylor, George R. Peck, Azel F. Hatch, George E. Bowen, and Ralph M. Easley.

Judge Henry G. Miller, Judge William A. Vincent and Ex-Solicitor-General Charles H. Aldrich were selected and presided as judges.

The Union League Club, the Marquette Club and the Illinois Club each tendered the use of their audience halls to the committee as a suitable place for the debate. The hall of the Illinois Club was selected and a limited number of invitations were issued to prominent men of the nation, also to men prominent in banking and commercial business, professors of political economy and students in finance. Mr. Horr arrived in Chicago on July 13, and made his headquarters at the Palmer House. The officers of the Illinois Club tendered to both Mr. Horr and Mr. Harvey quarters in their elegant club house. Mr. Horr preferred to remain at his hotel and Mr. Harvey accepted the invitation of the club, so that when the day arrived everything was in readiness for the great debate.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF HON. ROSWELL G. HORR.

Roswell G. Horr was born in Waitsfield, Vermont, November 26, 1830. In the spring after he was four years old he was taken with his father's family to the Western Reserve, near Cleveland, Ohio, where he grew to manhood on a small farm. His father died when he was ten years of age, and left his mother with a large family of children, of which he was one of the eldest. At nineteen years of age he went to work for himself as a hired man on a neighboring farm. During seven years he worked his way through college, graduating from Antioch College, Ohio, in 1857. Immediately after graduation he was elected clerk of the court of Lorain County, in which he lived, and served six years. During that time he studied law and was admitted to the bar, but practiced his profession only two years. In 1866 he moved to Missouri and engaged in the mining of lead for six years. In 1872 he removed to Saginaw, Mich., and engaged first in banking and afterward became a lumberman. In 1878 he was nominated for, and elected to, the 46th Congress, and afterward was elected to the 47th and 48th Congress, serving in all six years. After leaving Congress in the spring of 1885 he went upon the lecture platform, and for several years did nothing except that and campaign work. In the fall of 1890 Mr. Horr became a writer on the editorial staff of *The New York Tribune*, where he is still engaged. There is hardly any man in the United States who has engaged in as many public discussions or made as many public addresses as Mr. Horr.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF WILLIAM H. HARVEY.

William Hope Harvey was born August 16, 1851, at Buffalo, a little village on the big Kanawha River, in Putnam County, West Virginia. His father, Colonel Robert T. Harvey, a Virginian now living in Huntington, West Virginia. His mother's maiden name was Anna M. Hope, of Owensborough, Kentucky. His early life was spent on a farm near his native village. He received his early education in a country school, spent two years at the Buffalo Academy, and three months at Marshall College, in Cabell County, West Virginia. At sixteen years of age he taught school for three months, and again for the same period at the age of seventeen. He then began the study of law, and was admitted to the bar when he was nineteen years old. He practiced for five years in Cabell County in his native state, and then removed to Cleveland, Ohio, where he continued the practice of his profession. It was while living here in 1876 that he married Miss Anna R. Halliday of Gallipolis, Ohio, a daughter of Mr. John T. Halliday of that city. In 1878 he removed to Chicago, and two years later he became the special attorney of some wholesale houses in Ohio, and made his home in Gallipolis, Ohio, till 1884, when he removed to Colorado. At this time he retired from the practice of law, and made investments in Western property his business, spending his time between 1884 and 1893 in Colorado, Utah and California.

In May, 1893, he returned to Chicago, where he began the work that has resulted in the phenomenal sale of his books on the financial subject. His business experience has been varied, but always attended with success.

At one time he was part owner in a wholesale dry goods and notion house, and for a time managed the credit department. His law practice took him to many parts of the United States, which, together with his subsequent experience, has made him a man both metropolitan and cosmopolitan in character.

CHAPTER II.

THE FIRST DAY. THE MONEY OF THE CONSTITUTION.

AT 2 P. M., July 16, 1895, there was a decided atmosphere of expectancy at the Illinois Club, on Ashland boulevard, Chicago. Its beautiful hall, the walls lined with masterpieces of art, had been fitted up with temporary seats, making a convenient amphitheater, to accommodate two hundred persons. Most of the seats were filled with invited guests, among whom were Lyman J. Gage, President of the First National Bank, E. S. Lacey, Ex-Comptroller of the Currency, George R. Peck, General Solicitor for the A. T. & S. F. R. R., Howard S. Taylor, Alexander H. Revell, E. G. Keith, Ferd. W. Peck, A. B. Humphrey of New York, Col. J. C. Roberts of Tennessee, Gen. Joseph C. Sibley, of Pennsylvania, and Vincent Tissera, of Ceylon.

It was not until twenty minutes of three that the procession of judges, the disputants with their "seconds," the official stenographers and time-keepers filed into the audience room. Both Mr. Horr and Mr. Harvey were warmly applauded. Mr. Horr sat at the north end of a long table at the east end of the room, beyond which were the judges on a raised platform. With him sat L. G. Powers of Minnesota, Dr. S. A. Robinson of New York and Charles H. Sergel of Chicago, ready to assist in case of need. At the south end of the table sat Mr. Harvey, with Miss Josie Hix, his secretary, who kept his notes and reference books ready for use. Mr.

Harvey's assistants all occupied seats in the audience through the whole debate. Excepting his secretary, he was alone in the arena where the memorable contest occurred.

All being ready, Dr. Homer M. Thomas, president of the Illinois Club, arose and spoke as follows:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

DR. THOMAS (President of the Club):

The Illinois Club extends to you a cordial welcome. The occasion which assembles you here is one of great public interest. The subject discussed is of vast commercial and financial importance. In a club so distinguished for men eminent in the civic, business, financial, professional, and judicial life of our city, it is fitting that your discussion should take place here. Much of the future stability and prosperity of our country depends upon the correct solution of the silver question. Assembled here are distinguished gentlemen who have made this problem a life-long study. Let us hope that from the long, careful and able consideration this question will receive at their hands may come such conclusions as will lead to permanent prosperity in our country.

The Illinois Club unites with you in the belief that general good to all may be the result of these deliberations. It is now my pleasure, gentlemen, to present to you the Judges of the discussion, Hon. H. G. Miller and Judge W. A. Vincent, to whose care the further proceedings will be given. (Applause.)

RULES OF THE DEBATE.

JUDGE MILLER: Before introducing the contestants

the Committee of Arrangements desire to say a few words to the guests here present.

The parties to this debate, Hon. Roswell G. Horr, of New York, and William H. Harvey, of Illinois, have consented to the discussion which is about to begin, under fixed written rules which have been accepted and signed by both parties. These rules are as follows:

1. Before this discussion begins, each disputant shall submit to the other such currency laws and statistics* as he may regard as undisputed facts forming in part the basis of the discussion, and such as are accepted in writing by both parties shall form the agreed facts to be printed first in the official report after the title-pages. Said agreed facts in no event to consume more than fifty pages of the official report, and should they not consume fifty pages, the shortage is to be divided equally between the disputants in addition to the space hereafter mentioned.

2. The basis of the discussion is to be the doctrine set forth in "Coin's Financial School." Neither disputant, however, is to be confined to the points and propositions contained in said book, but either may introduce any point that may seem to him pertinent to the subject under discussion.

3. Neither disputant is to use more than 1,000 words in any one statement, question or answer, except where tables or statistics or statute laws are read as a part of said statement, question or answer; when such quotations are among those agreed upon as before provided, the same are not to be counted as a part of the 1,000 words, but all other quotations shall be considered as a portion of the 1,000 words to which the disputant using them is entitled.

4. That said official report, including the agreed facts above provided for, shall not contain more than 140,000 words, 5,000 of which shall be divided between the two contestants (2,500 words each) for use at the end of the discussion, and after it is through for such use in summarizing as the writer desires to make of it. And each

*Left out by agreement and introduced in debate.

will be entitled to 300 words additional, to be used as a rejoinder to the matter contained in the said 2,500 words summary. The remaining words, after deducting the agreed facts, are to be divided among the contestants equally. The 60,000 words or more thus left to each disputant shall be divided into six parts of about 10,000 words. In discussing the topics of any one of said chapters or other matter which he may deem important, he shall have the number of words not thus used in reserve to be added to his 10,000 words in any subsequent chapter, and he may elect to use more than 10,000 words in any one chapter, by having the number of extra words so used taken out of the number at his disposal in any chapter or chapters subsequently reached, and he may elect himself to which chapter or chapters the shortage of words is to be applied.

5. The contestants respectively may take the affirmative or negative in said discussion at their pleasure; the discussion to be a running fight at close range, under the rules hereby agreed upon, and to be conducted with decorum and politeness.

6. Each contestant is to have what he says taken down by a stenographer. The words thus taken down are to form the substance of the official report, except the agreed facts and summary of 2,500 words each heretofore provided for, and the rejoinders thereto, and also the questions by visitors and the answers thereto hereinafter provided for, and also such introductory matter as may be agreed upon between the disputants in the way of introduction to the official report, following the title-page.

7. Each disputant is to submit said summary to the other within seven days after the close of the debate, and the rejoinder is to be returned within two days thereafter.

8. Each contestant is to have the privilege of inviting ten gentlemen to be present at said discussion with whom each contestant shall be permitted to consult if he so desires during the progress of the discussion; the other invitations shall be equally divided.

9. Said discussion is to proceed daily, unless, from

sickness or other cause, either one of the disputants shall ask for a continuance, in which case it shall be granted for one day between each session. Each session is to last for three hours.

10. Said discussion is to begin on Tuesday, July 16, 1895.

11. It is agreed that during the last twenty minutes of each session any visiting gentleman may ask not to exceed three questions of each disputant, which, with the answers given, shall be embodied in the report as part of the discussion; each of said questions not to contain over fifty words, the answers not to exceed 300 words each.

The committee of arrangements have been legally advised that it is doubtful if the proceedings of a public debate could be copyrighted and thereby protected from mutilation. The committee therefore has arranged for this hearing as a private one, each person present being here only upon written invitation as the private guest of the committee and with no right to take or report any portion of the debate, such right being reserved solely for the official stenographers appointed by this committee.

At the same time the committee has made ample arrangements to give the discussion the widest publicity possible. Stenographers have been employed by the committee who, under direction of this committee, will take down a verbatim report of the speeches as they fall from the lips of the speakers; each day's discussion will be copyrighted and a type-written copy given to the newspapers, press association, and publishing companies under such conditions as will protect the copyright. With these safeguards it is hoped that the speakers and the public will both be sufficiently protected and that the authenticity of this official report of the debate will be beyond question.

I have the pleasure of introducing to you, ladies and gentlemen, the Honorable Roswell G. Horr, of New York. (Applause.)

MR. HORR'S OPENING STATEMENT.

MR. HORR: Judges and Gentlemen, it is agreed between Mr. Harvey and myself that previous to entering upon the general discussion, each of us shall make a brief statement defining in a general way the position he proposes to occupy in this debate.

The question which we are about to discuss is one that is not only receiving very great attention among the people of the United States, but it is one that is also receiving some attention from the nations of the Old World. The question involves the kind of money that shall be used by the people of the United States, and has to do with laws that will affect the great business interests of this nation.

The question of finance is a very complicated one, and there are some features of it about which the ablest men of the world have been differing for years.

The foundation of the discussion upon which we are about to enter is a small book published by Mr. Harvey, my opponent, and entitled "Coin's Financial School." The real aim and object of that book is to convince the people of the United States that this government alone should at once enter upon the free and unlimited coinage of silver upon the old ratio of 16 to 1. The wisdom of such a course I dispute. Mr. Harvey will still maintain the affirmative of that issue.

I will state in the outset that, from the beginning to the end of the book, there is hardly a proposition made to which I give my assent. I propose to controvert many things which are stated as facts, and shall at-

tempt to prove that the entire theory set forth by its author, if adopted by the people of this country, would lead only to business disaster and financial ruin. I do not now remember ever to have examined a book carefully in which I found so few statements that I consider worthy of belief, and I certainly never saw so many absolute errors crammed into so few pages. (Laughter.)

I am not here as an opponent of bimetallism. I believe in the use of gold and silver as money to the fullest extent that can be done on sound business principles. My position upon this question has been too frequently stated within the last five years to be misunderstood by any one. I believe that both gold and silver are the natural money of the world; that in all the larger transactions gold is better adapted to the business needs of the people than silver; that all the smaller business transactions of the human family for many years have been, and always should be, conducted with silver. I also believe that in all transactions of the nations of the world between themselves, the two metals should be used in the settling of balances, but only at their commercial value. I also believe that in the business of our nation the people should never attempt to use either metal except at its actual value, only in cases where one metal may be used as token money and be made redeemable in metal at its commercial value.

I have always entertained the hope that the business men of the world would yet come together in an international convention and agree upon some basis whereby gold and silver can both be used as the money of final settlement among the people of the entire world. I am very clear in my idea that until some such arrangement shall be made it would be simply suicide for this nation to adopt a system of free coinage of silver upon the old

ratio, a ratio which all the civilized nations of the world long since have discarded. I do not believe that any one government can fix the value upon any two metals and name a ratio which will be accepted by the people of the world or of the country itself so that the two metals will be used side by side. Consequently if our nation alone should attempt any such action, it would simply place our country upon a silver basis and the attempt would end in silver monometallism. If we are compelled to decide between gold monometallism and silver monometallism, then I am decidedly in favor of adopting the standard used by the civilized nations of the world. I do not believe that silver has ever been demonetized anywhere in the world. I believe that the law of 1873, which Mr. Harvey's book denounces as a "crime," was honestly conceived, openly advocated and passed by the American Congress after full deliberation, and because the people at that time who held seats in the American Congress believed that such a law ought to be enacted. I do not believe in the teachings of this book, that this nation is on the verge of financial ruin, or that starvation is staring our people in the face. I believe, if our nation should adopt the course advocated in this book, it would seriously injure the entire wage-earners of the United States. I believe we would destroy the confidence of the business men of the world in our integrity as a nation and that we would precipitate such a financial panic as our country has never before seen. I shall deny most emphatically that the great majority of the people of this country are in debt, and shall insist that three-fourths of the American people are creditors and not debtors, and that consequently the system which Mr. Harvey advocates would work great injury to the great majority of American citizens.

I will state still further that if this book, about which we are going to debate, is true, then I am all wrong. (Laughter.) It seems to me to be devoid of business sense from beginning to end, and I shall enter upon the work of attempting to prove that, and hope to be able to do it in language that shall be so plain and explicit that my fellow-citizens will be satisfied that I have accomplished my task.

Understand me, in a few words I believe that the American nation should have just as good money as any nation uses on the face of the earth; I believe that every dollar paid to a poor man for his daily toil should be worth as much as the dollars paid to men who are rich. I would have the money which measures values the most stable that can be devised, and would insist that buyers and sellers, lenders and debtors, as nearly as possible be required to use the same measure of values, and shall insist that repudiation in all forms is disgraceful and dishonorable in the case of nations, corporations or individuals.

What our people need is good credit, good money, good principle and sound business sense. Visionary schemes and debased money never yet made a nation prosperous. The quality of the money used in any country is far more important than the quantity. Laws should be drawn to protect the men who earn money as well as those who owe money. A man who works faithfully and lives on his daily earnings should never be sacrificed for the benefit of men who live on what they borrow.

But all these things will be more fully explained as the contest progresses.

MR. HARVEY'S OPENING STATEMENT.

Mr. Harvey: I am here to defend the facts and prin-

ciples in "Coin's Financial School." I am aware that the illustrations in that book are a great aid in presenting clearly its views. We find this true in our schools. Many scientific works rely largely on illustrations, and our newspapers find that illustrations make plain many ideas that could not otherwise be clearly expressed. And yet I am here to defend orally these principles. I expect to make good in this debate the following propositions:

1. That silver and gold are the money of the constitution. That the silver dollar was the unit of value in our coinage system in this country from 1792 to 1873, just as the yard-stick was the measure of length. That gold was measured in this silver unit, and concurrent coinage given to it (gold). That silver and gold combined constituted the legal standard of value in this country till 1873. Silver measured gold; the two together measured all other property.

2. That the act of 1873 was surreptitiously passed.

3. That during the period of 1792 to 1873 the mints were opened to the unlimited coinage of both metals into primary or redemption money, and that both were treated as such. That during that period people had a right to have either metal coined into full legal-tender money, and that the option was with the debtor to pay in coins of either metal.

4. That this bimetallic system made an unlimited demand for both metals to be coined into money, increased the demand for these metals, and under this law, authorizing any one to coin 371¼ grains of silver and 23.2 grains of gold into a dollar, there was no one willing to sell either for less than one dollar.

5. That the option to pay in either metal caused the cheaper of the two metals to be used, and transferred

the demand from the dearer to the cheaper metal and restored its relative commercial value. We are called silver men because we are defending the metal that has been demonetized, but we are nevertheless for both gold and silver.

6. That it is to the interest of the United States to act independently in the remonetization of silver at the ratio to gold of 16 to 1 without waiting for the action of any other nation.

7. That monometallism consists in the use of the dearer of the two metals to the exclusion of the other as primary or redemption money. That monometallism is an experiment on trial for the first time in the history of the world and began with the period of 1873; that it is impossible and impractical as a stable money measurement of values; is not based on scientific financial principles; is in the interest of the money lenders and against the interest of the property owners and laborers.

8. That the gold unit as the measure of values, with no concurrent coinage of another metal to assist it in performing the functions of primary money, has caused the fall in prices as compared with 1872, when the world's prices of property were measured in the money mass of both metals. That all prices of property and labor have declined accordingly as compared with 1872, except when held up relatively by increased demand or short supply, or combines and trusts, or special reasons affecting a particular service or property. That the average price of all production, except gold, will show this decline is adjusting itself to the gold standard. And that when we include in labor the unemployed and the time lost by those employed, there is a fall in wages of one-half as compared with 1872. That labor is adjusting itself to the gold standard meas-

urement of values. That the gold standard is confiscating the prosperity of the people, and depriving labor of work.

9. That the decline in prices covering a period of twenty-two years has as a rule made all classes of productive, mercantile and manufacturing business unprofitable That a falling market covering a long period, destroys the prospective profits based on cost of purchase and production, and a majority of our most astute business men cannot avoid failure or loss of capital under these conditions.

10. That it has worked a hardship and injury to debtors, who, unconscious of the causes that continuously reduced the prices of their property, have contracted debts during these twenty-two years. That this fall in prices causes a sacrifice of property to purchase the dollars with which to liquidate these debts. That this has caused the renewal of debts, the contraction of new debts to pay old debts and an enlarged volume of all debts—that this unjustly takes from a debtor his property and emphasizes the importance of a stable money measurement of value.

11. That in the end no one is benefited by a fall in prices, but the money lender, the owners of money and securities payable in money—fixed incomes.

12. That the foregoing facts and conditions produced by a change in our money measurement of values will impoverish the masses of the people, and points, by reason of the disturbances it will produce, to the overthrow of the republic. That the free coinage of both metals by this government in the ratio of 16 to 1 will restore prosperity to this nation.

To all unbiased men, and those who will lay aside their prejudices during the reading of this debate, I

expect to make good all of the foregoing propositions. Every fact in the "School" that Mr. Horr does not attack, I shall take for granted that he admits its truth. I am now ready to proceed in the order indicated in "Coin's Financial School" and as contemplated by the rules of the debate.

THE "SCHOOL" AN ALLEGORY.

MR. HORR: Before entering upon the discussion proper I desire to call the attention of my opponent to the manner in which this book is written. I desire to state to him that I understand that the book represents that a certain school was held here in the city of Chicago for the purpose of discussing financial matters and that the book gives the room where the school was held. I ask him to tell me plainly if there was ever any such school held in that or any other room in the city of Chicago. I find all through the book a large number of statements attributed to a very considerable number of the business men of Chicago, and I am informed that those men, never one of them, uttered a single word attributed to them. If they did not I want my friend to state so clearly, because then I will not be bothered with helping my friends out of any difficulty into which they may have been gotten on account of what they are said to have said when they never said a single word. (Laughter.) If the book is written as an allegory I would like my friend to state why he did not use, as all literary men have always done, the names of fictitious individuals—why he selected individuals well known to the entire community and put words into their mouths which they never uttered, unless he intended to convey the impression to his readers that those men were present and received the castigation

which he says he administered to them on the spot. (Laughter.) The book even goes farther; it describes the crestfallen manner in which some of these gentlemen left the room after being worsted in this fearful manner. (Laughter.) I want to know if any of them went out in the way he describes. (Laughter.) I feel now that what we want to get at is the fact about the book, so we will know where we are proceeding. (Applause.)

MR. HARVEY: The "School" is allegorical; it marshals the opinions of the two sides of this controversy, so that one in imagination can see the conflict of opinions and the contest as it proceeds. It puts in the mouths of the gold-standard advocates their well-known views, fairly stated, with which the country had been flooded up to the time the "School" was written. The strength of the book was intended to be in the fairness of stating these views. The fact that a little boy in knee breeches was the instructor of the men was supposed to be sufficient to fix the story as allegorical.

One reading Æsop's fables does not care whether the animals talked or not. Neither does he attach any importance as to whether the little boy talked or not. It is the subject and the truths uttered that gave to it in each instance its importance. Robinson Crusoe and his island never existed, Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" is imaginary, and the Legree plantation in "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was not an actual fact; but these stories are nevertheless entertaining and teach great lessons. From the time the parables in the Bible were written, this style of literature has been recognized. Our school literature is largely imaginary, and when the question is put, "John has five apples and gives two of them to his brother Henry, how many apples has he left?" the problem is imaginary, and put so purposely as an ob-

ject lesson to teach the principle of subtraction. Our greatest poems and the sweetest music that molds the heart in affection and love, animates the soul and moves the minds of men to daring deeds of patriotism, are imagery pure and simple. Imagination is the unlettered language of the soul, leading us on to a higher state that we know exists while yet the slaves of base motives and selfish ends.

If it is charged that actual characters are used in the book while similar books use fictitious characters, the answer is, that the well-known utterances and opinions of these men are used, and the further answer, that Shakspere used actual characters.

Mr. Horr: I desire to say, that to me the excuse is a very lame one. I am somewhat familiar with fiction, have heard of Shakspere before, but nowhere in the history of all literature can you find another instance of a man selecting his immediate neighbors and putting words into their mouths which they never uttered and then publishing it to the world, not only the fact that they uttered them, but giving the different peculiarities and expressions of their countenances when they were agonizing under their efforts. Such a thing is not known in the history of literature, and I submit that if my friend had studied the Scriptures a little more carefully when he was looking for the motto which I shall take up next, he would have found it somewhere stated that a man is not permitted to bear false witness against his neighbor.

He says that he put into their mouths the words that they themselves would have uttered. I have had that done for me so many times in my life that I know what it means. I never yet had a fellow state what I would say if I had a chance, who got anywhere near what I

wanted to say myself, and I submit to him, whether in kindliness he should not have submitted every one of those statements to his neighbors and received from them their consent that that is what they would have said if they had been present; at least they were entitled to that courtesy.

THE MOTTO FROM THE BIBLE.

But now I come to the motto of the book, which is this: "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes."

I would like my friend to tell me why he used that motto. Does he desire to intimate that the kind of finance which he teaches is something that babes will understand, but that people who know anything will never be able to comprehend? (Applause and laughter.) Is this his idea? Does he desire to intimate that he has received some inspiration from on high that enables him to make difficult questions plain so that sucklings can understand them when full-grown men won't know anything about what he is driving at? Of course I cannot conceive what the object of the motto is, but the motto usually leads up to the contents of the book. So I want to get at his intention so as to fully appreciate the exact position, mental and moral, that my friend occupies on this question. Be a little more explicit, Brother Harvey. Do you mean to intimate that the great complicated questions of finance are so simple that little children can understand them when grown men cannot find out anything about them? Is it your idea that when Newton saw the apple fall, if a little baby had been with him, the babe would have found out a good deal more from the circumstance than New-

ton did? Newton, you know, divined the laws of the universe, solved the great problem of gravitation. Have you got some method so that babes could have done as well as that? I would like to know the object of the motto and then I will proceed.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr misinterprets the meaning of that verse. The word "babes" is intended to mean the pure of mind and unselfish. It is in that sense that it is used in the Bible, and means that those pure of mind and unselfish can see clearly those things which the impure of mind and selfish cannot see or understand. The cause I represent is pure and unselfish.

THE PREFACE TO THE BOOK.

Now I begin. In carrying out the idea of an illustrated book, an illustrated preface was adopted to show the rise and decline of civilization concurrent with an increase and decrease in the volume of primary money. The two pictures that appear in the preface were used thus; the space below the pictures was limited in which to explain the illustration; so I used only sufficient of the authority to establish the principle to be taught as the space would permit of.

The authority used was the report of the Monetary Commission appointed by Congress in 1876, reported in 1877 and published in 1878. The copy used had the date of its publication on the cover and that date was given in accrediting the authority. It was afterward changed in the "School" to read 1876. I now read from the report the paragraph from which the abbreviated statement printed under picture in preface was made. It begins with the last two lines on page 49 and is as follows:

"At the Christian era the metallic money of the

Roman empire amounted to $1,800,000,000. By the end of the fifteenth century it had shrunk to less than $200,000,000. During this period a most extraordinary and baleful change took place in the condition of the world. Population dwindled, and commerce, arts, wealth, and freedom all disappeared. The people were reduced by poverty and misery to the most degraded conditions of serfdom and slavery. The disintegration of society was almost complete. The conditions of life were so hard, that individual selfishness was the only thing consistent with the instinct of self-preservation. All public spirits, all generous emotions, all the noble aspirations of man shriveled and disappeared as the volume of money shrunk and as prices fell.

History records no such disastrous transition as that from the Roman Empire to the dark ages. Various explanations have been given of this entire breaking down of the framework of society, but it was certainly coincident with a shrinkage in the volume of money which was also without historical parallel. The crumbling of institutions kept even step and pace with the shrinkage in the stock of money and the falling of prices. All other attendant circumstances than these last have occurred in other historical periods unaccompanied and unfollowed by any such mighty disasters. It is a suggestive coincidence that the first glimmer of light only came with the invention of bills of exchange and paper substitutes, through which the scanty stock of the precious metals was increased in efficiency. But not less than the energizing influence of Potosi and all the argosies of treasure from the New World were needed to arouse the Old World from its comatose sleep, to quicken the torpid limbs of industry, and to plume the leaden wings of commerce. It needed the heroic treatment of rising prices to enable society to reunite its shattered links, to shake off the shackles of feudalism, to re-light and uplift the almost extinguished torch of civilization. That the disasters of the dark ages were caused by decreasing money and falling prices, and that the recovery therefrom and the comparative prosperity which followed the discovery of America were due to an in-

creasing supply of the precious metals and rising prices, will not seem surprising or unreasonable when the noble functions of money are considered. Money is the great instrument of association, the very fiber of social organism, the vitalizing force of industry, the protoplasm of civilization, and as essential to its existence as oxygen is to animal life. Without money civilization could not have had a beginning; with a diminishing supply it must languish, and, unless relieved, finally perish."

I now pass the book to Mr. Horr.

The statement in the preface credited to Dr. Adam Smith is taken from page 117 of "The Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," by Adam Smith. (McCulloch.) The average price of wheat for the year 1455 was 1¾ pence per bushel; as expressed in our money, seven cents. All my authorities as I proceed will be exhibited to the other side, as I do these. (Applause.)

THE PASSAGE OF SCRIPTURE.

Mr. Horr: Gentlemen, I desire to state that my friend has spent his whole time answering something that I never mentioned or said anything about. I merely called his attention to the use of the passage of Scripture which he has now fully explained by saying that the passage does not mean what it says; that the word which is translated "babes" really means honest, disinterested persons, and then he informs us that he represents the honesty of the American people. It may be that that is some excuse for the use of such a motto as that. It seemed to me at the time a little sacrilegious as he used it. I do not desire to criticise him for that; but I do desire to say to him that that motto is not susceptible of the explanation he now makes of it. That motto was intended to illustrate the fact that a boy, a child even, like his young fellow who taught finance in his book, could distinguish the differ-

ence between right and wrong, and would be among the first to learn to live a pure life. But I submit to him that that motto does not give an excuse for a boy, because he is in knee breeches, to stop telling the truth. It does not give the boy any right to misrepresent facts.

I shall come to this thing that he has been reading about hereafter; and the trouble is, that when I come to that I don't know but he will have to read this same speech over again. I am taking the book up in the order in which I find it and I intended to commence pretty nearly at the beginning. I think I succeeded.

THE MEASURE OF VALUE.

My next quotation I find, still before you get to the body of the book, it is this: "All money is a medium of exchange, but primary money only is the measure of values." I do not desire Mr. Harvey to make a speech on the subject until I have stated my own position, and I would like to have him tell me in a word what he means by primary money? It is not defined as I can find anywhere in the book. What kind of money is primary money?

Am I entitled to an answer, Mr. Harvey?

MR. HARVEY: When you have finished and sat down, Mr. Horr, I will go ahead.

MR. HORR: I submit that a question so simple as that which is at the basis of this question should be answered as readily. I will sit down and let you answer it.

MR. HARVEY: The question asked is a part of the main argument in the book, and it would be out of place for me to answer this question now, and would disturb the logical arrangement of the argument as outlined by the book.

Mr. Horr: I have not succeeded in getting very much information. If I did not misunderstand him in his previous remarks when he laid down the positions he was going to occupy, he for the first time in those remarks gave his definition of primary money. I submit it to the reporters that he said "primary or redemption money" in the course of the explanation. If I am right then it is redemption money which he refers to in this motto. If that is what he means then I call his attention to the fact that the statement itself is not true.

"All money is a medium of exchange," it is true that far. But primary money only, or redemption money only, is not always the measure of values. We sometimes live and do business for years, and the measure of value that we use is not redemption money at all. I lived seventeen years, from 1862 to 1879, and saw the business of this country for years all transacted in money that was not redemption money, but that every dollar of it had yet to be redeemed.

The greenbacks that we did business with in those days depreciated in value, and yet we used those promises as the measure of the values of this country. The measure of value isn't so abstruse as some people think. The measure of value in every country is the term that people, by common use, come to understand as meaning a certain definite thing. When a man says in England a horse is worth so many pounds, he uses the word that the people there are accustomed to. I am so truly American, never having been in England in my life, and having no great desire ever to go there, that I have to stop and cipher before I can tell what it means when they tell me in pounds. In France they say a thing is worth so many francs. That doesn't convey any idea

to me until I convert it into the measure I am used to. In Germany the measure is a mark, but that don't mean anything to me until I reduce it to something that I am in the habit of using. It is just so with distances, just so with weights. If a man should tell me that I weighed a certain number of kilograms, if that is an expression that will do, I wouldn't know what he means, wouldn't know whether I was heavy or light; wouldn't have any idea about it. We use terms that we are familiar with.

Now the measure of value from 1862 to 1879 here in the United States was the greenback dollar. That wasn't a dollar of primary money, redemption money, it was a paper dollar, a promise to some time pay a real dollar, and it depreciated in value as the contest went on. Sometimes it was worth forty cents on the dollar, sometimes it was worth eighty, and when we got up toward redeeming it in good, straight, honest money, than it came to be worth just about the same as gold at that day. Now the error in that statement is a vital one. What is money? That is a question that has been asked by the scholars of the world for a good many hundred years. It has been answered in a very great number of different ways. But every writer that I am familiar with admits that originally money was always some substance that possessed value; it must of necessity be so. You could not have a yardstick that did not have length, because the yardstick is to find out the length of goods. You could not have a bushel measure that had no capacity, because capacity is what they are trying to measure. You could not use as a weight a substance that was lighter than air, that instead of pulling the scales down went up itself and left

the scales on your undertaking to weigh with it; you have got to have something that represents a certain amount of specific gravity. When we wanted something to measure values with, that is when the human family wanted something, they necessarily selected something that possessed some value. Almost every article in the world has, from time to time, been used as money, been used as the measure of values. One of the very first articles undoubtedly was the skins of animals; for they were easily handled, they could be counted, they were surplusage and used more or less by everybody for clothing and for warmth, consequently the human family at first commenced to use them as the medium of exchange. Now in a country where they did that, if a coon had been an animal that was sought, as it was when I was a boy and lived in the country, they would have called a sheep worth so many coonskins, and that would have meant just precisely the same thing as when we say each sheep is worth so many shillings or dollars. It meant the same thing, and the people had to be accustomed to the measure, and know, both the buyer and seller, just what was meant by it.

In the same way people used wheat for a time. If you will search the Scriptures you will find that very early among the Hebrew people measures of wheat, barley, oil, were used as money. In the contracts given when Solomon sent abroad to get men to build his temple the price is named in a certain given quantity of oil, and wheat, and barley; they used them as money. But people who used them had to understand each other alike. That is all. Now gold and silver finally came to be used as money simply because they were the best adapted for money uses of any substance that the world

had ever discovered. They came to be used as money just as naturally as wheat came to be used for the purpose of making bread. We have used wheat ever since the memory of man runneth for the purpose of making bread. Why? Because it makes a little better bread than anything else, and people like the best that they can get in this world. Gold and silver were not the first money. Originally, copper was more universally used as money than either of these metals, and I shall hereafter show you how we have been going from a money that is cumbrous, difficult to handle, a money that is not stable, a money that perishes; so we have been finally developing from a poorer quality of money to a better quality of money since the foundations of the globe.

WHAT IS MONEY?

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr and I agreed that somewhere near the beginning of the discussion we would define what money is, and then launch into the first chapter of the book. So far as his statement deals with the relation of primary and credit money mentioned in the fly-leaf of the book, I for the present ignore it, and will wait till I reach the logical place in the book. But I will now define what money is.

Money is a medium of exchange and a measure of values. It is a thing representing value. When we express price, we have reference to the unit of value or its equivalent. When we say that a horse is worth $100, we have reference to the relative value of the horse and the dollars—that is, that the horse in exchangeable value is worth one hundred times as much as the substance residing in the unit of value. Here is a primitive illustration of what a measure of values is:

If the law selects a bushel of wheat as the unit of value and wheat only is money, and the horse is worth one hundred bushels of wheat, then we say the horse is worth $100. If instead of bushels of wheat, grains of wheat were dollars or units, then when we expressed in terms of dollars the value of the horse, we would have reference to grains of wheat instead of bushels. In this case, the horse would be worth, say $10,000,000. So that, when we express in terms of dollars the value of anything, we have reference to the exchangeable value of the dollar with the thing exchanged for it. You send your agent out to sell a house and lot when sheep are dollars and he brings you 1,000 sheep. You send him out to sell the same house and lot when horses are dollars and he brings you only say, 100 horses. So that what constitutes the dollar and the quantity of substance from which it is made, in existence, governs the value of other property when expressed in terms of dollars. This is what we mean when we say that money is a measure of value.

With gold and silver in existence as primary money there is double the quantity of money, real money, as there is when gold only is in existence as primary money.

Money is also a medium of exchange. What is meant by that is this: Instead of exchanging one property for another property, we exchange it for money, and money being by law and usage a common medium of exchange, we are thus able to exchange *it* for the other property desired. We exchange property for money, and then exchange the money for other property or for services.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MONEY.

To understand the importance of money we must

consider the conditions that would exist if we had no money. It would then be a matter of barter and exchange—of one kind of property for another. Needing the wheat of your neighbor, you might offer him in exchange your horse, but not needing your horse he would refuse you his wheat. You would then have to continue looking for a man having wheat who wanted a horse, and the number of bushels of wheat thus exchanged for the horse would be the exchange value as between the wheat and the horse. Under these conditions, there being no money, commerce would be sluggish if it scarcely moved at all. If you were shipping property by railroad, you would have to give up a portion of the property in payment for freight, and if the property was not divisible, as a threshing machine and thousands of other kinds of property, you would have to pay the freight in some other kind of property. The railroad company would have to have places to store the property until it could again dispose of it; would have to refuse all kinds of perishable property, and would have no practicable method for paying its employes. Merchants would have to exchange the goods on their shelves for all sorts of property, and provide storage for it till they could again exchange it for other property.

There would be no practical method for paying labor in the thousands of industries, including type-setting. Hence there would probably be no books or newspapers, or if published, no convenient way to pay for them. We thus see the necessity for money—that its existence is essential to civilization. Thus seeing the condition that would be brought on if there were no money, we can better understand the noble function it performs and the importance of it. And yet the men of to-day

do not understand money and its relation to property and to society; if they did we would not be engaged in this discussion. It is to assist in its solution that this debate is in progress. We all agree that money is the blood of commerce; that it is the organic fluid of civilization; that without it civilization would practically perish. Mankind would still live, but not in a state of civilization. Where we do not agree, is as to what money should be made of, its quantity, and laws which operate to protect or divert it from the channels of trade. We thus have three points of difference:

First: As to what money should be made of.

Second: The quantity.

Third: The laws defining its use, and intended to protect it from being diverted from the function for which it is created.

Under this last head comes the question whether all money should be issued by the government, or all or parts of it should be issued by private parties and corporations. The necessity for money, the fact that it is the organic fluid of society, should make it solely a creation of the government. (Applause.) We regulate interstate commerce by laws, because it is a matter affecting society. Nothing is so intimately connected with the organization of society as money, and yet we have a school of financiers who advocate that it should be the creation of private parties and corporations and be regulated by them. (Applause.) It should become a fixed principle with us that the issuing of money is an act of sovereignty. (Applause.) Our monetary system should be fixed upon scientific principles by which every dollar is as good as every other dollar. (Applause.) All money should be a legal-tender in the payment of all debts, and no act of discrimination or nul-

lification or debasement of the currency by any one should be permitted. (Long continued applause.)

Mr. Horr: There is quite a large portion of that essay that is true; indeed I think there is more truth in that simple, short statement than can be found in the whole of Coin's School. It is true that money is the life blood of commerce and of business. It isn't true that money can exist only when it is created by law. Money was in use and well understood long before there were any laws upon the subject. Money does not have to be made a legal-tender to make it good money, even; that is a mistake of Brother Harvey. As a rule legal-tender laws are never needed except to make somebody take some money that is poor. No one ever yet had to enforce a legal-tender enactment to get somebody to take the best money in existence. People will take what is best whenever they can get it, and you don't have to have a legal statute to make them do it, you know. Indeed you may pass all the legal statutes you please in certain directions as to money, and the people will go right along and use the common rules of business in spite of your laws. That has been the history of the world. Legal-tender is used for the sake of adjusting disputed accounts. But legal-tender laws, except in the times of national calamity, are never needed to enforce the circulation of good money. We have to-day in the United States, as I remember, about half of our money, one dollar just as good as the other, and yet the half of it isn't legal-tender at all. A national bank note isn't legal-tender for debts or anything. All the silver certificates are not legal-tender, not one of them, and yet they are taken as readily as any of our money. Why? Why, because the folks want them, they have confidence in them, they

know they are good, and when a party believes a thing is good you don't have to force him to take it. Don't forget that. So, as a rule, legal-tender is always resorted to in emergencies when you want to compel somebody to take something that they really wouldn't like to take, and would prefer something else in place of that if you won't let him receive the other. That is the history of legal-tender. Now I don't dispute the fact that the government should regulate money. I am not for the purposes of this debate going to go extensively into the question of whether all currency should be supplied by the government, or whether it should be done, as it is in a large number of the civilized nations of the world, by corporations, and regulated simply by governmental laws.

ORIGIN OF AMERICAN MONEY.

Now we come to the real first question under debate. When this government became independent after the Revolutionary War we had no monetary system of our own. The people had become accustomed to doing business mostly in pounds, shillings and pence, the monetary system of Great Britain. However, on account of the large circulation of Spanish and South American silver within our borders, our people had become more or less accustomed to using the Spanish money; and as soon as Congress was organized, directly after peace was declared, when the first Congress of the confederation met, one of the first things they took up was the question of the monetary system. Libraries almost were written and published on the kind of money that this nation had better have. There were a few men who gave the subject great attention. Some suggested that the people were so familiar with the English system

that we should adopt that; others suggested entirely different money systems. Finally, if I remember right, Thomas Jefferson hit upon the plan of devising a system of money which should make our notation of money precisely the same as our notation in arithmetic. In arithmetic the people have become accustomed to starting with 1 and going each way; one dollar, ten dollars, twenty dollars, one hundred dollars, one thousand dollars. Or going down, one dollar, half, quarter, ten cents. Always either a multiple of a unit, or else a decimal multiple of a unit, a fractional multiple. You have no idea of the immense amount of literature that was written by the thinkers of that time, before any decision even was made in the Congress of the Confederate states (that is, our Confederate states, not the new one) upon that question of money. And finally they adopted Jefferson's idea. You will find a report of their actions in the fourth volume of the Journal of Congress, running from April 1, 1782, to November 1, 1788. The first law that was ever passed in this United States upon the subject of money was on the 6th day of July, 1785; that was two years after the subject had been discussed in every shape and form by the people and press of the United States. Congress then—I will use the exact words: "And on the question that the money unit of the United States of America be one dollar, the yeas and nays being required by Mr. Howell, every member answering ay, it was "Resolved, that the money unit of the United States of America be one dollar. Resolved that the smallest coin be of copper, of which 200 shall pass for one dollar. Resolved that the several pieces shall increase in a decimal ratio."

That was the first action taken by the American Con-

gress. They first fixed the unit—that is, the name of the thing that should be used as the measure of value—deciding that it should be called one dollar, and that the smallest division of that should be a half-cent piece, that it should be copper and that it should take 200 of them to make the unit. That was the first effort of the new government to establish a monetary system.

Now, every one will say they had not yet stated at all what the dollar should consist of, except that 200 copper half-cents should be one of them, and that was the first unit of measure that Congress established—200 half-cent coppers. That is all the law there had ever been on the subject, and all that had ever been said about it anywhere. (Applause.) So we had first the money of the daddies of copper, no doubt about it.

This work in Congress then was postponed until Tuesday, August 8, 1786, on the report of the Board of Treasury. At that time the Board of Treasury corresponded to our present committee of finance. On the report of the Board of Treasury, to whom they referred a letter on the 13th of October, 1785, they took up this money question and passed some laws that have nothing to do with coinage. Afterward they ordered that "Monday next shall be assigned for the selection of a superintendent for the northern district." Then came the report of the Board of Treasury: "Resolved,"—now comes the next important legislation upon this subject: "Resolved, that the standards of the United States of America for gold and silver shall be eleven parts fine and one part alloy." Originally that was the weight of alloy in all the coins of the United States. Afterward we reduced the alloy so that it was one part in ten.

THE MONEY OF THE CONSTITUTION.

MR. HARVEY: Replying first to what Mr. Horr said

about the legal-tender character of money, I call your attention to the fact that I said when our monetary system is arranged upon scientific principles then all money should be legal-tender. When so arranged there can be no such thing as depreciated paper money. (Applause.)

What Mr. Horr says about copper used as money during the continental days preceding the adoption of the constitution is trivial to be used in this argument. The first history of bimetallism or a permanent financial system for the United States was that considered by the constitutional convention at the end of the colonial days. Then statesmen came together to fix for you and me and our children to come after us a permanent financial system that would, together with other laws, free us from the selfish and aggressive policy of the European countries from which they had declared their independence. (Applause.) At the time our constitution was framed the details governing the concurrent coinage of the two metals in our financial system were under discussion in committees and between statesmen of that period. So while these details were left to Congress, after the adoption of the constitution, a bimetallic system was provided for in that constitution.

Article 1, Section 8, says, "Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coins." Section 10 says, "No state shall coin money or make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." It says gold *and* silver (applause), not gold or silver. (Applause.) This is the constitution. It took away from the states the power to coin money or to make anything a tender in payment of debts except these two metals. It re-

served to Congress the exclusive right to coin money. The states were to have these two metals for legal-tender money, but Congress would coin it for them. Copper or other metals could be coined into money by Congress, but the states could not make them legal-tender. Congress could, but the states could not. Thus the two metals given dignity and distinction were silver and gold, and upon these two metals only the states were to rely for debt-paying substance. Copper was coined, and since then nickel, into token money, but silver and gold were named in the constitution as actual money.

Congress was authorized to regulate their value; that is, to determine the relative value of the two metals. To the states had been reserved the right to use two certain metals, silver and gold, as actual money—not as tokens, but as money of the highest order; and Congress was to coin it and regulate its value. This was to prevent confusion in mint dies, as would be the case if every state had a separate mint with different pictures and letters upon the coins, and to insure uniformity and purity in the weight of the coins. For this reason the states surrendered the right to separately coin money, but expressly retained the right to the use of silver and gold as money, not one representing the other as silver is now coined representing gold, but both as money in their own right. (Applause.) Congress in good faith with the states has no more right to demonetize one of these metals than it has to demonetize both of them, without the consent of the states. (Applause.)

The men who framed this constitution then proceeded to give it the construction intended. They gave to both metals equal dignity, equal rights, except to make the

dollar of silver and it the unit of value, in which the value of gold would be measured, but with concurrent coinage with silver. They gave both metals free and unlimited coinage. Both were given full and unlimited use in the payment of debts. There was no discrimination made in the use of the two metals, except that the unit of value was to reside in the silver dollar, and that gold coins were to be of the value of so many silver dollars. This is the exact language of the statute, of the men who framed the constitution and knew the construction that it was intended that it should have.

Daniel Webster said (see Congressional Globe Appendix, pages 54 to 56, 24th Congress, second session, December 21, 1836), "Gold and silver is the money of the constitution." (Applause.) "The constitutional standard of value is established and cannot be overturned. To overturn it would shake the whole system. Gold and silver at rates fixed by Congress constitute the legal standard of value in this country, and neither Congress nor any state has authority to establish any other standard or dispose of this." (Long continued applause.) I now hand Daniel Webster's speech to Mr. Horr.

Mr. Horr: The difficulty with my friend Harvey rises largely from the fact that he seems to think that everything is trivial which he doesn't know anything about. But he is mistaken. There may be very many very serious matters. There have taken place very many very worthy matters and he may never have known anything about them. He thinks the Government of the United States originated in 1792. I don't know but he celebrates the Fourth of July, 1792—I don't know. I had supposed this Government commenced on the Fourth of July, 1776. He seems also to confound the

Colonial Congress with the Confederate Congress. We have had three Congresses in this blessed government of ours; the first was a Colonial Congress and lasted during the war; when our independence was acknowledged we then formed a confederacy and a Congress under the confederacy met for years, and it was the record of that Congress that I commenced to read to you about. Now if my friend had waited he would have found more food for his silver business than he is aware of—if he had waited till I finished reading the next resolution of that Congress. They had had a Congress and resolved on the unit which should be used in the money accounts of this nation. They fixed that unit at a dollar. They fixed the design to indicate what the unit is. Just where it came from I have never been able to satisfy myself; almost every one thinks it is the letter U with the letter S written over it, making the sign for the dollar, and that that is the origin of the sign, but that does not make any difference. It is simply an interesting fact. As I stated, Congress first decided in 1785 what the unit should be called, and the only thing that they designated was that it should be two hundred half copper cents. They dropped the subject. There was no provision made for the amount of any other substance at that time. The subject, however, was being agitated all the while and discussed by the United States thoroughly, and in 1786 Congress took up the subject again. Now they provided: "Resolved that the standard of the United States of America for gold and silver"—both together—"shall be eleven parts fine and one part alloy." That was precisely as they had decided before, that the money of the United States, being by the resolve of Congress on the 6th of July, 1785, a dollar shall consist of fine silver, 375.64 grains in each

silver dollar. That is the first establishment of what the unit should consist. Next, "that the money of account to correspond with the division of coins agreeable to the above resolve proceed in a decimal ratio agreeable to the forms and manner following—to-wit"—don't forget it. They were organizing a new system of money, a system that had never been known on the face of the globe,—making money history. Is that trivial? Why, it was the important act of that age.

"Mills: The lowest money of account, of which one thousand shall be equal to the federal dollar or money unit. Cents: The highest copper piece, of which one hundred shall be equal to the dollar. Dimes: The lowest silver coin, ten of which shall be equal to the dollar. One dollar: The highest silver coin, that between the dollar and the lowest copper coin so fixed by the resolve of Congress, July 5, 1785, there shall be three silver coins and one copper coin; that the silver coins shall be as follows: One coin containing 187.82 grains of fine silver to be called a half dollar; one coin containing 75.138 grains of fine silver to be called a double dime; and one coin containing 37.3 of fine silver to be called a dime; that the two copper coins shall be as follows: One equal to the hundredth part of the federal dollar to be called a cent; and one equal to the two hundredth part to be called a half cent. That two pounds and a quarter avoirdupois weight of copper shall constitute one hundred cents."

Here is provision again for the copper dollar: that it should consist of one hundred copper cents, and gave the weight of the coin; "that there shall be"—now mark—"two gold coins, one containing 246.363 grains of fine gold, equal to ten dollars, to be stamped with the impression of the American eagle and called an eagle; and the other containing 117.123 of fine gold, equal to five dollars, stamped in like manner and called a half eagle. The law then gives the mint price of gold and silver.

Now that is the first time the American Congress designated what should constitute a dollar. You understand when they named the unit of value a dollar, it did not mean anything but just the unit. It gave no definite idea until they had defined of what that dollar should consist. They might have called the unit a dodo just as well; it would not have meant anything until they had described by Congress of just what the dodo consisted; then the people would soon have learned to estimate values in dodos as readily as in dollars. The American Congress fixed upon three items, making them equal at that time to one dollar; that is, two and one-half pounds avoirdupois weight of copper was one of them. A number of grains of silver was another and a number of grains of gold was the other. That was the first arrangement the American Congress made on this question. He tells me it was trivial. Why, it was the basis of the entire action in 1792 of which you talk so much. They did not go to work and enact over again what that Congress had done—they did not have to. The unit of measure had been fixed; the names of the coins that we were going to have had been fixed; they simply changed the amount of gold and silver, as you will see, from the amount agreed upon by the Confederate Congress and fixed the amount by the law of 1792. Congress dropped the matter with the exception of one resolution passed afterward. They did not really organize the mint.

We had no mintage under the law of 1786; it ran along until 1792, when they established a mint and for the first time we had coin of the United States of America. When they came to that law they took for granted everything that had been done by the Confederate Congress. They did not go back and go

over again a single thing, but they changed the quality of the alloy, which was changed, if not then, afterwards, from one-eleventh to one-tenth, as it now is in this country, and they changed the amount of pure gold and pure silver which should be placed in the coins. Under that law, if you will figure it, Mr. Harvey, you will find that they established the ratio of 15¼ to 1. In 1792, when this matter was under consideration, there were letters written all over the United States; it was a matter that was discussed and runs through the Madison papers, pages and pages, as to what kind of a ratio should exist in this country between gold and silver. It was an important question. The Morrises, both of them able men, insisted that the unit of value should be silver alone. Jefferson insisted that it should be both gold and silver, and I will show in my next talk that Jefferson won in that contest.

MR. HARVEY: Then I understand Mr. Horr to claim that the silver dollar was not made the unit of value by the act of 1792.

MR. HORR: I will get to that in my next talk.

MR. HARVEY: If he will answer my question.

MR. HORR: But you wouldn't answer mine. I did want to do that way, you know. You insisted on the other rule. I could answer it very readily, it wouldn't take me but a quarter of a second, but I am afraid I will offend you.

THE ACT OF 1792.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr has read extensively and treated extensively the acts of the Confederate Congress preceding the constitution and the United States Congress of 1792. What took place in the Continental Congress will corroborate what I am about

to say took place in the United States Congress, but this is futile and of no pertinency; we should consider the law that was made based upon the constitution that came after the Continental Congress in the United States Congress organized in pursuance of that constitution.

The straits to which the colonies were put between 1776 and 1790, when we, as a government known as the United States, went into operation, were those of expediency, but no permanent system was adopted, awaiting the constitution of the regular United States Congress; and it is to the action of that constitution and the Congress that met in pursuance of it we should as educators upon this question direct our attention. The constitution said Congress should regulate the values. The first thing to do in regulating the value was to fix a measure just as Congress under a like clause fixed the bushel measure in which to measure wheat. It fixed a unit of value in our coin money system as the first necessary step to carry out the requirements of the constitution to regulate the value of the coin. The substance of the discussion that led up to the fixing of that unit of value which we are now discussing is in the state papers of that period which are reproduced in the report of the International Monetary Conference of 1878, and consist of the following documents:

1. Mr. Jefferson's notes on the establishment of a money unit and of the coinage for the United States.
2. Report of a grand committee on the money unit.
3. The coinage system proposed to Congress April 8, 1786, by Samuel Osgood and Walter Livingston, who constituted the Board of Treasury.
4. The resolutions on coinage of August 8, 1786.
5. Report of Alexander Hamilton on the establishment of a mint.
6. Miscellaneous documents.

From these it will be seen that Mr Jefferson, on page 438, advises the following:

1. A golden piece equal in value to ten dollars.
2. The unit or dollar itself of silver.
3. The tenth of a dollar of silver also.

The above is his exact language. I here pass the book containing these state papers and what I am quoting to Mr. Horr.

Further on Mr. Jefferson says:

"The unit or dollar is a known coin and the most familiar of all to the mind of the people. It is already adopted from South to North; has identified our currency and therefore happily offers itself as a unit already introduced. Our public debt, our requisitions and their apportionments, have given it actual and long possession of the place of unit. The course of our commerce, too, will bring us more of this than any other foreign coin, and therefore renders it more worthy of attention."

Further on he says:

"If we determine that a dollar shall be our unit we must then say with precision what a dollar is."

And then, again, on page 442, he says:

"The quantity of fine silver which shall constitute the unit being settled, and the proportion of the value of gold to that of silver, a table should be formed from the assay before suggested, classing the several foreign coins according to their fineness."

And again on page 443 he recommends that a committee be appointed

"To prepare an ordinance for establishing the unit of money with these states; for subdividing it and for striking coins of gold, silver and copper on the following principles:

"That the money unit of these states shall be equal in value to the Spanish milled dollar, containing so much fine silver as the assay before directed shall show to be contained on an average in dollars of the several dates circulating with us.

"That this unit be divided into tenths and hundredths."

From the report of the grand committee that fixed the silver dollar as the unit we find on page 447 the following:

"The quantity of pure silver being fixed, that is to be in the unit or dollar, and the relation between silver and gold being fixed, all the other weights must follow."

On page 449 we find:

"On the 8th of April, 1786, the Board of Treasury directed to the President of Congress their report on certain principles for establishing a mint, accompanied by a letter to the President of Congress. The report was in triplicate, and contained, as will be seen below, three distinct schemes, each of which was set forth in the report with great particularity. . . Each of these reports proposed a silver dollar as the unit."

The opposite view of the question was presented by Alexander Hamilton, and his report is in the book before referred to and now before me with the other documents referred to.

On page 456 he says:

"But, if the dollar should, notwithstanding, be supposed to have the best title to being considered as the present unit in the coins, it would remain to determine what kind of dollar ought to be understood; or in other words what precise quantity of fine silver."

On page 458 he again says:

"The next inquiry toward a right determination of what ought to be the future money unit of the United States turns upon these questions: Whether it ought to be peculiarly attached to either of the metals in preference to the other or not; and if to either, to which of them."

On page 479 Mr. Hamilton recapitulates and advises as follows:

"One gold piece equal in weight and value to ten units or dollars.

"One gold piece equal to a tenth part of the former and which shall be a unit or dollar.

"One silver piece which shall also be a unit or dollar.

"One silver piece which shall be in weight and value a tenth part of the silver unit or dollar."

Thus, it will be seen, Mr. Hamilton recommended two units, one to be made from gold and one to be made from silver.

Mr. Jefferson at one time came very near yielding to the arguments of Mr. Hamilton, but the whole matter went into the U. S. Congress at its second session; and out of the recommendations and discussions that had been made, the result was the enactment of the law of 1792, and Section 9 of that act is the one that settles this question. It is as follows:

"And be it further enacted, that there shall be from time to time struck and coined at the said mint, coins of gold, silver and copper of the following denomination, value and description, viz.:

"Eagles. Each to be *of the value of* ten dollars or units and to contain $247\frac{1}{2}$ grains of pure or 270 grains of standard gold.

"Half-Eagles. Each to be *of the value of* five dollars and to contain $123\frac{3}{4}$ grains of pure or 135 grains of standard gold.

"Quarter-Eagles. Each to be *of the value of* \$2.50 and to contain $61\frac{7}{8}$ grains of pure or $67\frac{4}{8}$ grains of standard gold.

"*Dollars or Units.* Each to be of the value of a Spanish milled dollar, as the same is now current, and to contain $371\frac{4}{16}$ grains of pure or 416 grains of standard silver.

"Half-Dollars. (Was fixed one-half the weight of the dollar.)

"Quarter-Dollar. (Was fixed one-quarter the weight of the dollar.)

"Dime. (Was fixed one-tenth the weight of the dollar.)"

Thus we see that what Jefferson had recommended for the unit was adopted and the statute so reads and the gold coins are valued in that silver unit, and Hamilton's suggestion for two units, a gold unit and a silver unit, was not accepted by Congress, and only a silver unit was provided for in the act of 1792.

Mr. Horr: Very largely what my friend has claimed in his last remarks is true. There is no doubt that Congress in 1792 established a unit of value, and fixed it in silver, as he says, at 371¼ grains pure silver, but what they also did was to attempt to establish bimetallism. They aimed to fix it so that we would use both measures of value and both coins of money. That is what you are trying to do now. You claim that because we have got only one measure in gold that we are all wrong, and now you try to make out that we never had two when the government was formed.

Now what is the fact? As I stated before, Congress had already fixed the monetary system. Congress under the constitution recognized every law that had ever been passed by the Confederate Congress. Very many of these statutes are in force to-day, have never been repealed, never been amended. It was part and parcel of the legislation of this great United States of America.

Now when they came to act and establish the mint then they came to the most practical part of this business; they were to put into force this new money that they had devised in theory; they had already fixed the unit of accounts at one dollar; they had not established as yet of what that unit should consist. The Morrises and Jefferson at first thought it should be silver; Hamilton thought it should be gold. And now, Mr. Harvey, finally, after all this stuff which you have read, which was all interesting, Hamilton made a mint report

and sent that report to Jefferson, after all this business had been through with—he had written all these documents that are so interesting that my friend has read, he had discussed this question pro and con, he returns the copy to Hamilton and writes him this letter:

"Dear Sir: I return you the report on the mint, which I have read over with a great deal of satisfaction. I concur with you, thinking that the unit must stand on both metals." (That was Jefferson himself.) "And just principles will lead us to discard the legal proportions altogether, to inquire into the market price of gold in the several countries with which we shall be principally connected in commerce, and to take an average from them.

"(Signed) THOMAS JEFFERSON."

MR. HARVEY: Hand it to me.

MR. HORR: No, I couldn't give you this; you will find it in this book, you will find the letter there in that book. This is private property.

MR. HARVEY: I don't use anything in this debate that Mr. Horr cannot see. (Applause.)

MR. HORR: Do you deny that Mr. Jefferson wrote that letter?

MR. MILLER (one of the judges): I hope the audience will remember the suggestion made here and applaud the speaker after he has finished, but while the speaker is talking I hope you will refrain from applause.

MR. HORR: I state that that is a letter written by Thomas Jefferson; do you deny it? You know it is true.

MR. HARVEY: I know he wrote a letter, if you will pardon the interruption.

MR. HORR: Certainly.

MR. HARVEY: But the unfairness of the statement is in not reading the date of it.

Mr. Horr: I have given you this letter which shows for itself that it was written after Mr. Hamilton had sent him his report. He was Secretary of the Treasury and they were discussing his mint bill and Jefferson had come to the conclusion himself that they should adopt a double standard, that we should have bimetallism in this country. Hamilton had insisted on that, Hamilton had stated repeatedly that he preferred the gold unit and the gold measure—my friend is right. Hamilton wanted the dollar of gold a unit, because he imagined that unless they had a coin of that dimension the people would not get onto the fact that we were using a double standard, and he wanted a coin of silver and a coin of gold each for the dollar, which they refused to do, and not because they did not propose to establish bimetallism, but because they thought the gold coin would be too small, that the people would not use such a coin and that it would be useless to coin them. They afterward tried it and found out that the position was correct, you could not circulate them; they were so small that the people were constantly losing them, and they went out of use.

Now, then, the whole aim of the law of 1792 was to fix it so that we could have bimetallism, both gold and silver money, and both gold and silver as the measure of value. If that is not true won't you tell me what they figured so carefully for to find out what the ratio should be between gold and silver? What difference did it make whether they got it just right or not? They spent months writing letters all over the world trying to get at the exact ratio between the two metals. Jefferson and Hamilton agreed that it should be settled on no legal enactments, but by the market value of the two metals. Didn't they know what they were about? They

finally agreed that they would call it 15 to 1, that 15 ounces of pure silver should be worth one ounce of pure gold, and subsequently when they had established the silver unit which they intended to establish and make it the same size as the Spanish dollar, because the people used that all the while, they made a mistake and did not get the amount correct. Our dollar first coined, the one that my friend Harvey is so attached to, is not the old Spanish dollar at all; that was a larger piece than the one the mint laws actually provided for. How did it happen? They weighed a large number of Spanish coins and took the average. These coins were worn and consequently in getting the amount that was in the Spanish dollar they took the average of a large number that they weighed and took that as the weight of the Spanish dollar. That is history. Nobody denies that. And consequently having fixed—now mark—having fixed the amount of the silver piece, the amount of the gold piece followed when they had fixed the ratio between gold and silver, and then when they came to coin—he has read it correctly—when they came to enact the coining law of 1792 they enacted just what he says, that the gold dollar—they provided for that first—in Section 9: "There shall be from time to time struck and coined at the mint coins of gold, silver and copper."

How did they happen to mention gold all the while first if it was not going to be used? How came it that such is the order through all these laws? And they fixed eagles to be of the value of $10 or units—they couldn't say anything else because they did not coin a gold piece of one unit, so they had to equal the eagle to ten. Now is not one-tenth of that a unit then? Come, now, be honest about it. If one eagle is ten units, ain't one-tenth of that one unit? What do you say? It

seems to me it is an intellectual proposition that even a babe could understand.

They provided for quarter eagles, then they provided for dollars or units each of the value—and gave the kind of coin to be in each unit.

Now was that bimetallism or not, Brother Harvey? Did that establish bimetallism? I answered some questions for you, what is the matter? They thought they were establishing it anyhow, whether they did or not. But you intimate that they did not in this book. I have "Coin's Financial School." During the best of this discussion on page 8, the author says:

"Both were legal-tender in the payment of all debts, and the mints were open to the coinage of all that came. So that up to 1873, we were on what was known as a bimetallic basis"—

I will have more of that hereafter—

"but what was in fact a silver basis, with gold as a companion metal enjoying the same privileges as silver, except that silver fixed the unit and the value of gold was regulated by it. This was bimetallism."

Is it bimetallism? It is the unit based only upon one metal and then the other metal regulated according to that. That is what we have now; that is the same kind of bimetallism we have. You then had the silver monometallism and now we have—I don't deny it—gold monometallism in this country to a certain extent.

Now, to follow what you were writing about. You claim in the outset that these individuals when they fixed the unit, although they fixed one in silver, that they did not intend to have gold as a measure of value. Is there a man in the world who has arisen to years of discretion that believes that? Is there a man on the face of the earth who does not know that there was an attempt, and an honest one,—for these men were

honest men,—an attempt to use both metals as a measure of value and as a circulating medium? That is what they were trying to do. They consequently figured carefully to get such a ratio as would enable the people of this country to use both metals and have them go hand in hand in the transactions of life. Wasn't that what they tried to do? They failed. Do you know why? I do. They undervalued gold as compared with silver. That is, they made the ratio 1 to 15 legally when in the commerce of the world and the markets of the world the ratio was about 15½ to 1. The result was we were on a silver basis and gold ceased to be used as money after 1792 to any great extent in this country. How do I know that? I know it because every man in Congress that spoke upon the subject in 1834, when we changed the law, said so. There was not a dissenting vote, not a dissenting word on that subject as to whether we had lost our gold coin in this country or not. It was admitted by every one. The only dispute they had was—and if you will read the debates you will bear me out in it—was as to whether they should fix the ratio at 1 to 16. Mr. Dunham of Massachusetts warned them against that ratio; he says:

"You will do for this country for silver just what the first law did for gold, you will get silver so that 16 ounces of it will be worth more uncoined than it is coined. Gold will take possession of the money transactions of this country and we will lose our silver coins."

That was the only question debated at any length during that entire revision of the coinage act of 1834.

Mr. Harvey: If the reader of this debate will consider that what we are now considering is the unit of value fixed by act of 1792, and not ratios, he will follow this debate better. I will abundantly take care of Mr. Horr when we come to the discussion of the ratio. I

am now confining myself to what was fixed as the unit of value. I do this in order that this argument may be logical and the reader may follow our financial history till we get to the present time, and I will then stay with Mr. Horr.

Mr. Horr: Will you permit me to make a correction in my statement? That letter of Jefferson's is dated February, 1792, just before the passage of the law.

Mr. Harvey: The letter of Mr. Jefferson that Mr. Horr refers to was written prior to the passage of the act fixing the unit. As I said a few minutes ago, Mr. Jefferson came very near at one time agreeing with Hamilton, but it went into the United States Congress with Mr. Jefferson opposing Mr. Hamilton's proposition, and the United States Congress fixed upon silver and rejected Mr. Hamilton's proposition to make two units. There were to be no two measurements in our monetary system as the result of the wisdom of our forefathers.

Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury for twelve years under Jefferson and Madison, made a written report on the relative value of gold and silver, December 31, 1829, in which he says: (I now pass it to Mr. Horr. It is on page 424 of volume 2 of the writings of Albert Gallatin (Adams). It is this that Gallatin says:

"The American dollar of 371¼ grains of pure silver is the unit of money and standard of value on which all public and private contracts are founded."

In 1868 Chief Justice Chase said in Bronsen vs. Rhodes, 7th Wallace 247:

"The act of 1792 established a mint for the purpose of a national coinage . . and its general principles have controlled all subsequent legislation."

That is, subsequent legislation from 1792 to 1868, the date of the Chief Justice's decision. He then said:

"The same act established the dollar as the money unit, and required that it should contain 416 grains of standard silver.

"The act of 1849 authorized the gold dollar, but conformably to the established standard."

I now pass that decision to Mr. Horr.

Mr. Hooper, while steering the bill to demonetize silver through the lower house of Congress, April 9, 1872, said:

"The silver dollar, which by law is now the legally declared unit of value, does not bear a correct relative proportion to the gold dollar."

See Congressional Globe, part 3, XLIId Congress, page 2305, which I now pass to Mr. Horr.

The Chicago Tribune, which will be regarded as good authority by those believing in its present policy, said on February 23, 1878:

"In 1792, Congress enacted that 371¼ grains of silver should constitute the American dollar; that this dollar should be the unit of value of American money and be a legal-tender in payment of all debts, public and private. During the eighty years that followed, though the size and quantity of pure metal in the gold coins were changed more than once, the silver dollar, the American unit of value, remained unchanged."

I now read from a text-book on finance by Roswell G. Horr, page 42:

"The first unit of value in the United States was the silver dollar. The act of 1873 made the gold dollar the unit of value instead of the silver dollar."

Mr. Horr said in the issue of the *New York Daily Tribune* of April 15, 1895:

"The law which originally made the silver dollar the unit of value was enacted April 2, 1792. I have that before me. It is entitled 'An Act Establishing a Unit and of Regulating Coins of the United States.' In Section 9 that act provides for coining eagles each *of*

the value of $10. The amount of pure silver in the standard silver dollar has never been changed. * * * * * * The only change in the amount of metal in the coins that have been made has been by cutting down the size of the gold coins. * * * * * The man does not live who can successfully dispute a single statement that I have made thus far."

And I say now what Mr. Horr said, that he cannot now successfully contradict that which I corroborate by the words of the statesmen who fixed silver as the unit of value, and he cannot successfully make you believe that some other measurement was made in place of it. Neither will he and the gold standard advocates and writers who are now misrepresenting this question throughout the country convince an intelligent American people that any other unit of value was fixed by the patriotic forefathers who founded this government other than the silver dollar.

I now hold in my hand a silver dollar of the year 1799. On its edge in deep cut letters are the words "One Unit." And while the law that made that dollar existed it was as impossible for you to truthfully say that the silver in that dollar was worth less than a dollar as to say that the figure 1 is less than 1. That much silver was declared to be a dollar, and when you measured anything by value you measured it in that dollar, and when you measured *it* you measured it in itself. (Applause.)

And thus, gentlemen, silver was made the unit of value.

MR. HORR: Now all this talk of Mr. Harvey's is of very little importance so far as I am concerned. I might admit all that he claimed and then it would not change my attitude on this question in the least. What I say is that when they passed that law they intended to es-

tablish bimetallism in the United States. They did fix the silver dollar as the unit of value, there is no doubt about it. And they also fixed of what the gold coinage consisted, and there were a number of units, and then they defined the ratio between the two metals; consequently, when they fixed the ratio 15 silver to 1 of gold there were two standards, a gold standard and a silver standard. We did not use the gold standard at all up to 1834. You can pass a law as to a standard and the people can annul it in spite of all the statutes in the world. The people adopt the currency they wish to use, and you can not legislate them out of the habit either. They had undervalued gold. The gold dollar was worth more under the first mintage than the silver dollar; consequently we did have—and he is right about it—the silver standard in this country up to 1834. Legally a man could pay any debt by tendering the ten units of value in the gold coin, but people did not tender it because the silver dollars were the cheaper; they could get ten silver dollars for less labor, less everything than they could ten gold ones, consequently the gold left the country. Every member in Congress who spoke on that question in 1834, stated that we had absolutely no gold left, except abraded coins. The result was, they sought to remedy the difficulty; they wanted that we should be a truly bimetallic nation, so they attempted to fix a new ratio. When I come to the ratios I will tell you why they reduced the gold dollar instead of changing the silver dollar, but that comes under the head of ratios, but the fact itself comes under the head of the unit. They changed the gold unit, that is, they changed the ten units, the five units and they necessarily changed the one unit. After that gold commenced to circulate and we lost our silver, and the people of this coun-

try, when they talked about a dollar after that, always meant a gold dollar, they never meant a silver dollar. Silver dollars were worth all the way from two cents to five cents premium during the time from 1834 to 1873. It was not the measure of value in this country at all after 1837, after we had had time to get our gold into circulation. Now, Brother Harvey, I will tell you how you will know. Whenever you see any coin of any country quoted at a premium, that coin is never being used at that time as the measure of values in that country. Every time they quote a metal or a coin at a premium it shows that something else is the measure of values, and that that coin is being measured by the other thing; because if they refer to an article that is the measure of values it can never be either below or above par. You say in your book it cannot be below, I add neither below nor above par. The unit of value measures the one that the people use and it will always be at par. It is just as impossible to make a thing more than itself as it is to make it less than itself; things in the world are just what they are, that is universal, you know, and consequently in the table you give in your own book between 1834 and 1873 you quote silver always at a premium. That shows that we were measuring values in this country by the gold dollar. That is all I have to say on that subject now.

Mr. Harvey: I again call the attention of the reader to the fact that I will take care of Mr. Horr on the relative value of gold and silver when we get to that question.

I want now to call the attention of the reader to the fact that for several years our side has claimed that silver was fixed in 1792 as the unit of value, continuing

to 1873, and it was strenuously denied by the other side —denied by the other side to such an extent that they went to the trouble in this city of getting an ex-judge, an associate of bankers, to render an ex-parte opinion that silver was not fixed by the act of 1792 as the unit of values, and telegraphed that opinion all over the country, and it was supported by newspapers editorially all over the country, and a professor in a university that is built with a money-lender's capital wrote articles published in the *Times-Herald*, denying that silver was made the unit of value in 1792, and these articles were copied in their friendly papers all over the country. And now we come face to face with the other side, where they do not dare to mislead; and in the first joint debated question in this controversy they are forced by the truth to admit that 371¼ grains of silver was fixed as the unit of value (loud applause) by the act of 1792 and remained such to 1873.

MR. HORR: Who is admitting that?

MR. HARVEY: The reading of the debate thus far will show that Mr. Horr has admitted it.

WHY THE UNIT WAS MADE OF SILVER.

Now, why was silver made the unit of value by that act? This was to be a government of the people with its organic laws, its financial policy and its statute laws intended to promote the interest of the many—the poorer people. Silver was the money of the plain people. The study of history showed that the rich would take care of themselves, and that the selfishly rich were aggressive and were seeking to promote class legislation intended further to enrich themselves. It was from this class legislation that favored the few that our forefathers declared their independence, and in establishing

the principles of republicanism they drafted a financial policy with other laws that were intended to counteract the influences of the selfish few, and to be in the interest of the many. They, therefore, of the two metals favored silver, the people's money.

How did they favor it? They made it the unit—the thing in which gold was to be valued. There were to be no two yardsticks in the money they adopted. Gold was to be valued in silver. The gold coins were to be of the value of so many silver units. The unlimited demand for both metals by opening the mints to all that came would tend to hold the commercial parity of the two metals at the ratio fixed for their coinage; but, if it did not, then the ratio would be changed and the change would be made in the gold coins. The silver coins were not to be re-coined or changed. Silver—the people's money—would be treated as sacred. The unit would be undisturbed. This was the intention of those who framed our republican government and our financial laws.

To call in all the silver coins to re-coin them would be a serious interference with the business of the people. To re-coin the gold coins would not, to any great extent, disturb the middle and lower classes who seldom handle them. There having been at all times an average of about one hundred silver coins in circulation to one gold coin, the cost would be proportionately about one hundred times as much to re-coin the silver coins as to re-coin the gold coins. And the time consumed in re-coining the silver would be proportionately a greater disturbance to business than to re-coin the gold. Thus there was wisdom as well as a love of principle in what our forefathers did. When European influence at a later period had disturbed the commercial

parity of the two metals, our government changed the ratio. They changed the gold dollar from one-fifteenth the weight of a silver dollar to one-sixteenth the weight of a silver dollar. Twelve grains were taken out of each eagle, and other gold coins were reduced proportionately. The weight of the silver unit was not disturbed. The quantity of pure silver in the unit of value remained the same from 1792 till 1873. The gold coins were changed to be the value of so many silver units.

Thus, of the two metals, silver was the favored one. It was to control gold. The people's money was to control the rich man's money. This was republicanism. This was as it should be. The mints were open to the free and unlimited coinage of both metals, and either answered for use as money. The two combined was the measure of values for all other property. Gold was measured in silver, and property measured its value in the money quantity of gold and silver. This was intended to be the financial system of our republic, instituted to resist the influences of the monarchies of the Old World.

Mr. Horr: Mr. Harvey did not intend to mislead me, but he said he would only speak two or three minutes and he has taken eight.

Mr. Harvey: I did not intend to mislead you, but your statement called me out.

Mr. Horr: I say you did not intend to mislead me. I want to say here the question of the unit I have not disposed of to-day, I am not through with it, and as he has taken so much time I want to give a word as to why they re-coined the gold instead of the silver. The reason was because we had been on a silver basis and they did not intend to disturb the relation of money to the business of the country. Gold had not been used, and

they purposed to put the gold dollar so that it would equal the silver dollar, the one we had been using and the one under which contracts had been made; and so they resolved to cut down the gold dollar to make it even with the one the people had been using,—that is the reason and the only reason.

CHAPTER III.

THE SECOND DAY. HOW SILVER WAS DEMONETIZED.

THE second day's debate opened promptly at 2 P. M. with an increased attendance. Gen. A. J. Warner of Ohio, and Senator Pettigrew of South Dakota, were in the audience. Ex-Solicitor Charles H. Aldrich occupied Judge Vincent's place on the platform.

MR. HORR: Gentlemen: In opening the discussion to-day I desire to call the attention of my friend to the fact that he read an essay here yesterday upon the condition of the world during the fifteenth century, especially up to the discovery of America, 1492. He read that statement without its having been called out at all by me, as I had not attacked that part of his book. But he made such an elaborate effort to show the condition of things in the world from 1400 to 1530, that I have taken a little pains to find out if I could whether there is any truth in the representations that he makes, and I find that history leaves him in as bad a condition in this regard as it does in regard to the bulk of the statements in "Coin's Financial School."

Mr. Harvey gave one price quotation of wheat, as if one swallow makes a summer or one quotation makes a comparison. He quotes the report of Senator Jones, who is not an historian, and that report and Mr. Harvey unite in saying that the world was drifting to destruction in 1492. Was it?

Let the answer be given from good authority: Hall-

am's "Middle Ages," volume 2, page 555, in Note, says:

"M-Laber (Mem. de l' Acad. des Inscript. Nouvelle Serie XIV 23) calculates the power of silver under Charlemagne, compared with the present day, to have been eleven to one. It fell afterward to eight and continued to sink during the Middle Ages. The average of prices during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was six to one."

The price of wheat from the eighth to the fifteenth century thus doubled, and the value of silver decreased to one-half, according to Hallam and this renowned French authority. This is the exact opposite of the statement which Mr. Harvey makes without citing one leading historian or economist or statistician past or present. But two historians do not establish the depreciation of silver and the appreciation of wheat during the Middle Ages any more than the single wheat quotation of Mr. Harvey is a sufficient peg upon which to hang his indictment of the world in the past.

Let us turn to a third authority, one accepted by men the world over. I cite from Prof. James E. Thorold Rogers, the political economist and historian who defends from history the claims of organized labor, and more than any other single writer shows that true history is an exhibit of the condition of the toiling masses.

He tells us in his "Economical Interpretation of History," page 262, that from 1261 to 1400 the price of wheat per quarter averaged 5 shillings 10¾ pence, and in the next 140 years averaged 5 shillings 11¾ pence. The price of lead was in the first period 90 shillings 9¼ pence per fother, on an average, and in the latter 104 shillings 4¼ pence. Rogers on the same page says: "Similar illustrations can be given for other commodities." Here in England a slight rise only in prices from 1260 to 1540, but still a rise where Mr. Harvey

asserts a fall. A more marked advance occurred in the years 1500 to 1540, years uninfluenced by the silver treasures of America, which Adam Smith says did not affect prices in England before 1570. Rogers' "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," page 343, says:

"Now it is clear that prices were rising, though slowly and moderately, during the first forty years of the sixteenth century. In the first decade the money value of the principal necessaries of life, corn and wheat, were at the ratio generally speaking at which they stood for two centuries. In the last decade, 1530 to 1540, they had risen by 20 to 40 per cent."

But something beside the selling condition of wheat and lead should be taken into account. We must ask after the toiling millions who alone make the State. Did their lot become more miserable with the passage from the eighth to the fifteenth century, as charged by Mr. Harvey? Let Professor Rogers speak upon this subject, "Agriculture and Prices." He says: "The fifteenth century and the early years of the sixteenth were the Golden Age of the artisan and the laborer."

In "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," page 84, Rogers says, in speaking of the statute of laborers of 1495, it is, "*considering the cheapness of the times, exceeding liberal. At no time in English history have the earnings of laborers interpreted by their purchasing power been so considerable as those which this act acknowledges.*"

At that time Rogers shows this purchasing power of wages was substantially 50 per cent higher than for the average for the 280 years, 1261 to 1540. In "Agriculture and Prices," volume 4,p. 5, he says: "So cheap were the means of life during the fifteenth century, and so good, relatively speaking, was the rate of wages, that even the farm hand would have found little difficulty in emancipating himself."

Mr Harvey: What year was that?

Mr Horr: That was in the fifteenth century, that was the time when you say everything was going to the bow-wows.

Hyndman in his "Historical Basis of Socialism" doubts whether any European community ever enjoyed as great though rough plenty as the English yeoman, craftsman and laborer of the fifteenth century.

Hallam quotes Malthus on page 360, volume 2, of "Middle Ages," as showing how in England the purchasing power of wages rose from the time of Henry III. to the time of Henry VI. Malthus agrees with Rogers in his rosy picture of the closing days of the fifteenth century.

In the same book, page 562, Hallam calls attention to the moral and economic improvement in the last part of the fifteenth century. He says in speaking of these changes of the preceding century, "The first and perhaps the most important of these was the gradual elevation of those whom unjust systems of polity long had depressed; of the people itself as opposed to the small number of rich and noble by the abolition or the desuetude of domestic and predial servitude."

Here we find Rogers agreeing with Hallam, Leber, Malthus, Hyndman, and others. They tell us that the lot of the millions in Europe was rising before 1492, and that of the feudal aristocracy, with its tyranny, was crumbling to a fall.

Mr. Harvey and his free silver friends identify prosperity and the progress of man with the lot of the feudal nobility of Europe and not with that of the toilers.

Rogers, as well as Hallam, speaks of "the gradual elevation of the people themselves as opposed to the small number of the rich and the noble."

Later I shall show that in his treatment of the present, as of the past, Mr. Harvey stands as the exponent of the rich and not of the toilers, whose welfare should first be considered by the legislation of the State.

MR. HARVEY: When among the fly leaves of the "School" yesterday, to assist Mr. Horr in getting out of them, I left him meditating on a verse from the Bible while I passed on to the preface of the book. I volunteered to explain the preface without waiting for it to be attacked, because gold standard papers all over the United States had charged that it was a forgery; that no such quotation as was there used was ever made from the report of any monetary commission or any other official document, and to show that the gold standard papers, as usual, were wrong, and the "School" was right, I read from the report of the United States monetary commission of 1876, not for the purpose of entering into an argument on political economy of the year 1400 to 1500, but simply to show that all of my friends from New York and elsewhere who had accused me of forgery were wrong. Now I am not going to argue with Mr. Horr that the monetary commission did not know what they were talking about. He shall not get me, at any point in this debate, to divert my mind from the regular argument and logical arrangement of the debate. When a man could put together words that would convince an unthinking workingman that he is better off to-day by far than he was in 1872, and can convince a farmer that he is getting higher prices now than he was in 1872, I would expect him to convince a crowd, who are not studying history, that prices rose during the dark ages at the very time that they were falling, and that laboring men were faring well at the very time when they were working as the serfs of the lords of Europe.

Dr. Adam Smith, an able historian, whose work I put into Mr. Horr's hands yesterday, confirms all that there is in that monetary commission. Page 117 gives you the table of the rise of prices that contradicts everything that Mr. Horr has said here. The encyclopædias in your libraries will confirm that report of the monetary commission and contradict everything that Mr. Horr has said. I want to assist, if I can, the people of the United States to understand this financial question, and to do it I am going to go step by step along through this argument, and do not expect again to be diverted as much as I have been at this point to answer an irrelevant matter. I am done with that. Now I proceed.

YESTERDAY'S DEBATE SUMMED UP.

In a few words I wish to recapitulate the debate of yesterday. Thus far we have considered two questions, gold and silver as the money of the constitution and the unit of value in our monetary system fixed by the United States Congress, and what existed as our monetary unit from 1792 to 1873. The debate is of value thus far in eliminating the doubt that has existed on these two points in the minds of the people—a doubt that has been produced by misrepresentations made by those advocating the gold standard. A reading of the debate thus far settles these two questions in favor of the book we are discussing.

I have not followed Mr. Horr when he has attempted to lead the argument away from the point under discussion, for in their turn we reach all of the questions, and the readers can the more readily understand the application of what we say. I wish, however, in a general way, to sound a keynote on this subject. It is

this: Gold and silver have been honest money for centuries, and under free coinage and equal treatment they have been practically at par with the legal ratio fixed for their coinage; under these laws both were money in their own right, each having equal purchasing power, and both adapted to use as money; population and the demand on the money market are growing every year, and there was no good reason for debasing one of these metals, discriminating against it, and destroying the demand for it that gave to it its value in the markets.

As the debate proceeds I expect to force Mr. Horr entirely from his proposition, that the book we discuss is full of errors or that there are any errors in it affecting the principles we are to discuss. I propose to show who has been deceiving and misleading the people on this financial subject. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: Gentlemen, I want to say that I am surprised that my friend, after taking so long a time yesterday to prove to the people of the United States that the year before the discovery of silver in the new world silver money had become so scarce that the people were on the verge of starvation,—that after devoting so long a time to it he should now accuse me of trying to divert him from the regular work before us, when it is the very work he himself introduced. I propose now to clinch this business by quoting from Prof. George Gunton, the author of "Wealth and Progress," who is a man perhaps as well acquainted with the laboring classes and with their history in the past ages as any man that lives to-day, a person whom I know intimately. He says on page 140 of "Wealth and Progress" that in 1496 wheat was five shillings and five pence ha'penny, and in 1514 it was five shillings and four pence. If we take the average for the decades in

which each of these years occur, which is still better, we will find the result to be the same. The average price of wheat from 1441 to 1450 was five shillings and three pence and three farthings; from 1491 to 1500 it was five shillings and three farthings; and from 1511 to 1520 it was six shillings and eight pence, three farthings.

MR. HARVEY: That price is not per bushel.

MR. HORR: No, not per bushel, per quarter; but it shows that wheat had been steadily advancing instead of going down as you claim. Now I proceed. The next thing I desire to call your attention to is the matter we were talking about when we closed last night; the question whether the framers of the bill of 1792 intended to establish two measures of value. Mr. Harvey criticised Judge Vincent for having decided that case in his remarks yesterday, but very tamely in comparison with the statements which he made about him in print soon after he made the decision. He even called him dishonest in that criticism. I want to say just by way of explanation that I have noticed a peculiar thing. When men get bitten with either the fiat money craze or the free silver craze it has a peculiar effect upon them; they instantly become egotistical and abusive of every one who differs from them. It is a symptom that they seem to be unable to avoid.

Now Judge Vincent is a reputable citizen, I take it, of Chicago. Some private individuals submitted a question to him, and he decided it as he honestly believed was right, and there *is* this peculiarity about it, it *is* right. (Laughter.)

JUDGE VINCENT ON THE DOLLAR OF 1792.

Here is what Judge Vincent decided.

"It is undoubtedly true that the milled dollar as it was

then current was the starting point, and the number of grains to compose a gold dollar was ascertained by dividing the number of grains in the silver dollar by fifteen. But this does not alter the fact that the units were expressed in gold and silver. On the contrary it seems to show that both were made units of value. The word unit was employed as the equivalent of dollar, and the dollar was to consist of either one of two different things, one-tenth part of 247¼ grains of gold, or 371¼ grains of silver, just as equal values may be embodied in given weights of any two given commodities, such as wheat or corn. A unit of value is the unit in which values are expressed. The values both of gold and silver are expressed in the act of 1794, so we have two units of value. If both had not been so expressed we could not have had bimetallism. The unit is simply the starting point in reckoning money."

Then to skip a paragraph, he says:

"The language of the proposition submitted for decision is not as clear and satisfactory as might be desired, but I am of the opinion that under the act of 1792 the unit was to be the dollar. The value of this unit was to be measured in both gold and silver, 371¼ grains being the quantity of silver and 24¾ grains being the quantity of gold which were to equally express the measure and value of the unit adopted."

He consequently decided in that way.

Now I have before me a letter of Mr. Leach, who was for many years the director of the mint, a man whom I know well and who is considered authority on all the money matters in the United States. He was one of the commissioners, appointed, I think by President Cleveland, to go abroad upon this subject. He takes precisely the same view that Judge Vincent took.

He tells us:

"If, as Mr. Turck says, the silver dollar was the unit which measured the value of the gold coins from 1792 to 1873, what becomes of the act of January 18, 1837 (supplementary to the act of 1834, which

changed the ratio in coinage to 15.98 to 1), in which act no reference whatever is made to units, but in prescribing the silver coin says: 'The dollar shall be the weight of 412½ grains'? Nothing about unit, 'and the gold coins of the weight for the eagle shall be 258 grains, and that for all sums whatever the eagle shall be legal-tender of payment for ten dollars.' The true reason that the gold dollar was reduced in weight in 1834 to conform to the new ratio rather than the silver dollar, was that gold being undervalued by the ratio of 15 to 1, gold coins constituted no material part of our circulation."

Just as I stated last night exactly.

"The bulk of the circulation in 1834 consisted of silver coins, and it was easier practically to change the gold dollar than the silver dollar. Does not Mr. Turck perceive that this claim that the silver dollar was the unit of value is inconsistent with the bimetallic system? The bimetallic system presumes a unit of account, a unit of name or number to be represented in coinage by a given quantity of gold and a given quantity of silver. If either is the sole measure, the system is not bimetallic. So if the silver dollar was the unit of value in this country from 1792 to 1873 we did not have a bimetallic but a silver metallic system.

(Signed) "E. O. LEACH, Ex-Director of the Mint."

I submit that that decision was exactly in accordance with the facts, but I find in the report of the mint for 1868-84 the document submitted by Mr. Knox, who was the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, a report in which he stated, "By the act of April 2, 1792, 371¼ grains of pure silver and 24¾ grains of pure gold were declared to be equivalent one with the other and to the dollar of account."

Mind you, this was written before this discussion on the subject of demonetizing silver at all, written by an expert upon this very subject, and again in the same report he states: "The present laws consequently au-

thorize both a gold dollar unit and a silver dollar unit, differing from each other in intrinsic value." That was the reason he proposed the law of 1873.

MR. HARVEY: Yesterday at the close, after I had quoted as authority for silver being the unit the statute itself, the utterances of Secretary Gallatin, a decision by Chief Justice Chase of the Supreme Court of the United States, and other numerous authorities, including Roswell G. Horr, of New York, Mr. Horr then admitted that the silver dollar was the unit of value, and the record of yesterday shows that. Now, in view of his attempt to try to twist something back into the discussion by which we are to believe him as saying one thing yesterday and something else to-day, I leave him to such fate as the readers of this debate think is proper. (Applause.)

In his constant attempt to try to discuss bimetallism, the relation of silver and gold, before we get to that which is in the second chapter of the "School," he is trying to mix the subject up. When we get there we shall see that neither Mr. Horr nor Judge Vincent knows what bimetallism is, and many things that he is now mixing us on will then be cleared and Mr. Horr will be even as a babe. (Applause.)

We agreed to take up the subject of demonetization, the act of 1873, in to-day's debate, and having waited for him to begin and he not beginning, I now will start. (Applause.)

MR. HORR: I beg pardon, you misquote me. I stated last night that I had not got through with the unit of value, that I had some other things to submit, in so many words, and we did not agree to take up any one subject at any particular session, only that we would take them in a certain order and let them run until we had finished them.

Mr. Harvey: And the order was that the "Crime of 1873," as we call it, came next after the discussion of the unit.

Mr. Horr: I am not through with that yet.

Mr. Harvey: Well, I am, and I will go on. (Laughter.) Words are our ammunition in this debate, 60,000 words apiece being allowed to us, and if the readers think that I have neglected some side issues that Mr. Horr has introduced, I want to tell them now that I do it in order to devote my part of the words in this debate to that which will do them more good than following Mr. Horr off on side tracks. (Applause.)

THE ACT OF 1873.

To understand how silver could be demonetized in this republic, the reader should understand that we then had paper money, and no silver or gold was in circulation, except in California. The same situation existed in England, following the French wars in 1816, when silver was dropped from the mints there.

The conspiracy to demonetize silver was regarded by those engaged in it as a business transaction, just as those who visit Washington and other capitals, to accomplish by legislation a sugar trust, or a trust on school books, or anything else, consider it business.

The conspiracy originated in London. European financiers had discovered that the demonetization of silver by England had no effect on the commercial parity of the two metals at the ratio fixed by France. It was therefore apparent that in order to break the commercial parity and substantially depreciate silver, all of the great governments would have to be included in the legislation needed. The subject was discussed among these

financiers informally in London and Paris, and very few were included from among those who understood its ultimate effect. A good deal of diplomacy, concealment and misrepresentation was practiced in securing the coöperation of politicians in Germany, France and the United States. The subject was discussed without disclosing the ultimate aim of those who directed the conference.

Following his trip to London and Paris Mr. Sherman introduced a bill in 1868 that was on its face intended to establish the gold standard. Senator Morgan of New York jumped on it, in the Finance Committee, with "all fours," and Sherman saw that Morgan understood genuine bimetallism, and this bill died that day and was never heard of again. Senator Morgan's term of office expired in 1869, and at the very next session another bill made its appearance. Those who took an open and avowed interest in the new measure were Mr. Linderman, Director of the Mint; and Mr. Knox, the Comptroller of the Treasury, who, at the end of his term of office became President of a national bank in New York; John Sherman in the Senate and Representatives Hooper of Massachusetts and Stoughton of Michigan in the House.

The bill this time went to a committee, in which the second attempt to leave out the silver dollar again was discovered, and it was inserted at the ratio of 15½ to 1, which was the French ratio. This provided for a dollar of 384 grains. This was the equivalent of the French five franc piece.

To knock this dollar out surreptitiously at the last moment then became the plan of the conspirators. The only question they would have to fight would be the change of the unit of value from silver to gold, and

on this they could depend by falsely representing that gold was virtually then the standard by common consent of nations; that it had been rendered so by the large production of gold, and by other specific arguments supported by special influences. Thus it became a bill, innocent on its face as to demonetizing silver. Demonetization consists principally in closing the mints to a specified metal, thus cutting off the coinage demand for it and leaving it only a commercial value.

WERE FOREIGN SILVER COINS LEGAL TENDER?

Mr. Horr: You will excuse me, Mr. Harvey, but previous to commencing my discussion of the law of 1873 I call your attention to a passage on page 9 in your book, because you have already announced here to-day that you propose to convince me that what this book says is absolutely true and that I am wrong about it. You say, prior to 1873 there were $105,000,000 of silver coined by the United States and $8,000,000 of this was in silver dollars. Now I understand you have since corrected that amount. I make no point upon the fact that you were in error as to the amount; such errors occur with every one, but I am told that in your last book—indeed I have it—you correct that statement. But this is what I want to call your attention to.

"About $100,000,000 of foreign silver had found its way into this country prior to 1860. It was principally Spanish, Mexican and Canadian coin. It had all been made legal-tender in the United States by the act of Congress. We needed more silver than we had, and Congress passed laws making all foreign silver coins legal-tender in this country. I will read you one of those laws—they are scattered all through the statutes prior to 1873.

"Here Coin took up a copy of the laws of the United States relating to loans and the currency coinage and

banking published at Washington. He said a copy could be obtained by any one on writing to the Treasury Department. He then read from page 240 as follows: 'And be it further enacted that from and after the passage of this act the following foreign silver coins shall pass current as money within the United States, and to be receivable by tale for the payment of all debts and demands, at the rates following, that is to say: The Spanish pillar dollars, and the dollars of Mexico, Peru and Bolivia, etc.'"

Now I have the coinage laws of the United States, every one that has ever been passed since 1792, and I state, Mr. Harvey, that in no law within the lids of that book are all the foreign silver coins made a legal-tender. I defy you to show a single law that states anything of the kind. And the very law which you quote where you stopped with the "etc.," if you had finished the quotation and had read the whole of the law it would have shown you that your first statement was not true. (Applause.) You left off the very part which restricted the legal-tender quality of foreign coins.

The very first law that passed on the subject after the law of 1792 was passed on February 9, 1893, an act regulating foreign coins, making them legal tender and establishing their value.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that from and after the 1st day of July next, foreign gold and silver coin shall pass current as money within the United States and be a legal-tender for the payment of all debts and demands at the several and respective rates following and not otherwise:

"Viz.: The gold coins of Great Britain and Portugal, of their present standard, at the rate of one hundred cents for every twenty-seven grains of the actual weight thereof; the gold coins of France, Spain and the dominions of Spain, of their present standard, at the rate

of one hundred cents for every twenty-seven grains and two-fifths of a grain, of the actual weight thereof. Spanish milled dollars, at the rate of one hundred cents for each dollar, the actual weight whereof shall not be less than seventeen pennyweights and seven grains; and in proportion for the parts of a dollar. Crowns of France, at the rate of one hundred and ten cents for each crown, the actual weight whereof shall not be less than eighteen pennyweights and seventeen grains, and in proportion for the parts of a crown. But no foreign coin that may have been, or shall be issued subsequent to the first day of January, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-two, shall be a tender, as aforesaid, until samples thereof shall have been found, by assay, at the Mint of the United States, to be conformable to the respective standards required, and proclamation thereof shall have been made by the President of the United States."

That is the way it goes on—"and not otherwise." Does that make all foreign coins legal tender?

MR. HARVEY: Do you want me to answer you now?

MR. HORR: It makes all foreign coins named in that act legal-tender, if they come up to a certain standard, that is, if they have so much fine gold and so much fine silver in them, and if they are worth so much, then, and not otherwise.

MR. HARVEY: Now can I answer?

MR. HORR: Certainly.

MR. HARVEY: It provides the amount that each shall be received for, received by tale.

MR. HORR: Certainly, but unless they are up to the standard they are not legal-tender.

MR. HARVEY: Can I answer you further?

MR. HORR: I will get the very law quoted from, because it is a good while afterward. You skipped the section that made the gold dollars also a legal-tender. You are asking me questions. What made you do that?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr, in writing a book or making a speech, when your number of words are limited, unless you want to confuse the reader with a great big volume, in making a quotation it is not necessary to quote that which is not pertinent to the subject you are treating; otherwise you load down the book till no one will read it. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: I agree with you, but when you state that the government passed a law requiring or making all silver coins a legal tender and also in the same act they made gold coins a legal-tender, why did you quote the silver part and leave the gold out unless you wanted to impress your readers with the fact that silver was considered the most important, which wasn't true?

Mr. Harvey: Can I answer you now?

Mr. Horr: Yes, I have no written essay, I am here to work. (Applause.)

Mr. Harvey: When a man is discussing cattle he doesn't talk hogs.

Mr. Horr: Sometimes cattle and hogs are the same, both live stock.

Mr. Harvey: And when a man is discussing silver and the manner in which it was treated by our forefathers, and comparing it with the way in which it is treated by you people now, it wasn't necessary to refer to how they treated gold or copper. (Long-continued applause.)

Mr. Horr: Unless your treatment is such that you are misleading your readers as to the manner of legislation upon that subject.

Mr. Harvey: So, you are misleading yourself.

Mr. Horr: No, I am not. What made you stop with your "etc."?

Mr. Harvey: Because I had quoted all of the statute necessary to show that they had made foreign silver legal-tender.

Mr. Horr: No, you hadn't, you had quoted all there was necessary to show that they had made legal-tender certain coins if there had been nothing attached to it.

Mr. Harvey: There is nothing attached to it.

Mr. Horr: There is; I will read it.

Mr. Harvey: You refer to the amounts for which the Spanish coin of such a name is received in American money, and the Mexican coin for so much, the British coin for so much, meaning to tell the American people how much they could pass that coin for as expressed in our money. That is not necessary in order to establish the principle I was stating, that foreign silver was legal-tender in this country. The point is this: Our mints tested these foreign coins and valued the silver that was in them. The alloy of much of that coin was different from our alloy, so it was necessary to assay those foreign coins and see how much they were worth in our money; that the mints did and Congress put into that act how much a certain foreign coin was worth in our money, and that is stated in that statute where he accuses me of leaving out what was unnecessary for me to state in establishing the principle that our laws made foreign silver legal-tender. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: When you left out that you left out the very fact which showed that a number of foreign coins were not a legal-tender, because none were made such except they came up to a certain standard. But away on ahead you speak of 1873. Now up to 1873 you said that they had made all these a legal-tender. Did you think so? Here is the law of 1857 passed upon the same subject, when they declared that none of them should be legal-tender and required the mints of the country to melt them up and re-coin them all, and repealed the very law that you have been talking about. (Applause.)

That is the fact about it. Now I claim that this is a serious matter, I admit that I had no idea for a moment that you could defend the proposition. To me it is preposterous. Do you claim that all the silver coin that was in the United States at that time was a legal-tender? Why, not anywhere near half of it was ever a legal-tender. Congress pointed out what should be legal-tender, and none other was. The mint was required to measure or weigh rather and assay coins and fix the amount that they were worth, but the statutes of the United States at that time never dealt with gold and silver separately on this subject. Ain't I right? They did the same for gold that they did for silver, a fact which you—I don't say purposely but inadvertently—covered up. You are in such a state of mind that you can't see anything if it says gold. (Applause.) That is the trouble, and you skip everything that has the word gold in it, that is all. (Applause.)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr accuses me of misrepresentation. Now I never have attempted yet in dealing with the public to mislead them. And in dealing with this financial question I have looked at both sides of the question to judge it from its merits. But I will settle one question of misrepresentation that I am charged with right here, because it settles several at once, and will leave Mr. Horr to explain something. In reading this section that I quoted in the book as to foreign coin, he asks me why I didn't put gold in along with silver, and said that the statute so read, gold and silver, and that I had skipped gold. Now I call Mr. Horr's attention to the statute that I quoted, and gold is not in it. It says silver only. (Applause.) A man is not guilty of misrepresentation every time somebody accuses him of it. (Applause.) On that same page I

said that the statement made by gold-standard advocates that only eight million dollars of silver was in circulation prior to 1873, was not true, and that instead of eight million dollars in silver being in circulation prior to 1873 there was one hundred and five million dollars in silver in circulation prior to that time coined at our own mints. Now he says that that one hundred and five millions is not correct. What is the correction? I did make a mistake. The Treasurer had made a mistake in the book that I copied it from. When he corrected the mistake six months afterward it read 143,000,000. (Applause.) That is the only misrepresentation that the book is accused of. We sometimes under-estimate that which is in our favor. We think that is a better quality than to exaggerate that which is in our favor. Now I proceed.

THE ACT OF 1873 CONTINUED.

The bill to demonetize silver was pressed. If passed through Congress in this form, the intention of the conspirators was to strike out secretly the single line providing for the silver dollar the size of a French five franc piece, and with the bill thus enrolled the mints would be closed by its terms to silver, except the trade-dollar. To make the bill operative in this respect when the standard dollar clause was erased, a section was inserted in the latter part of the measure that there should be no coins struck at the mints except those hereinbefore provided for. The trade-dollar clause could be easily repealed or limited under the purchase clause, and this was subsequently done. As to the fractional silver coin, the bill would so read as to close the mints to silver for that purpose, as did the Act of 1853. The right to deposit for coinage only existed as to the silver dollar. To bridle this dollar was their object. To de-

ceive Congress and at the last moment destroy the standard silver dollar was the purpose. This was the program that was afterward faithfully carried out. If that single line, giving unlimited free coinage to a silver dollar, the size of a French five franc piece, had been left in the bill, we would have had bimetallism with the unit on gold.

To understand why a bill changing the unit from silver to gold, with the dollar dropped out at the last moment and thus fraudulently changing our system, could be put through Congress as against formerly well recognized monetary principles, one must consider the situation as it then existed.

There was no silver or gold then in circulation except in California. Paper money was our currency. Coined money was not daily asserting its importance as in 1854, when the money power tried to demonetize gold. If it had been in daily use in 1873, it would have been an object lesson reminding congressmen of the principles on which coined currency is founded. A majority of members of Congress had entered public life after the suspension of specie payments in 1861.

To consider the moral status of Congress at that time is important, also. An era of corruption in official life followed the war; the average congressman appeared to believe that public office was a private gift, and that it was to be utilized to benefit himself and those who had assisted him to office. This condition in 1872-3 had led to all kinds of schemes being pushed through Congress for the benefit of private parties and special interests. The halls of Congress swarmed with lobbyists intent upon the passage of their several measures, out of which large sums of money were to be realized as the result of pending legislation. Out of this corrupt period came

disclosures that caused articles of impeachment to be preferred against Vice-President Colfax for complicity in the Oakes Ames fraud, causing him to abandon official life in disgrace in the year 1873. The resignation of Secretary of War Belknap, for bribery, followed in 1873. Corruption was charged in committee reports against numerous congressmen in connection with the Land Grant swindle, and a still larger number growing out of the Credit Mobilier scandal of 1872 and 1873, in which two senators and three congressmen confessed their guilt.

MORE ON THE FOREIGN SILVER LAW.

MR. HORR: Mr. Harvey, I am sorry to have to take you back again to this statute, but I know you desire to get this thing correct. I cannot think you intentionally try to mislead these people and the people of this country. The law which you marked and sent to me is not the law at all that you quote in your book.

MR. HARVEY: How do you know it is not?

MR. HORR: It is not, it is not the same language, it is not the same words. Take your book and I will read word for word; there is a gold clause preceding this silver one.

MR. HARVEY: That has a silver and gold clause.

MR. HORR: That has, but that is not the one you quoted from. Don't misunderstand me. That is not the law that you quoted part of and left off the rest. Now take your book and watch: "And be it further enacted that after and from the passage of this act, the following foreign silver coins shall pass current as money within the United States and be receivable by tale, for the payment of all debts and demands, at the rates following; that is to say, the Spanish pillar dollar,"—is that there?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr—

Mr. Horr: Well, is that there?

Mr. Harvey: I will bring you the act that includes that. This is a republication of the statute.

Mr. Horr: But I have got it as you quote it.

Mr. Harvey: But this is a copy of 1894. I will bring it to you at the next session.

Mr. Horr: The one you take is not the one you quote. The one Mr. Grier handed me provides for silver; this is the money of Mexico, Peru and Central America; and you stop at Bolivia. This is not the money of Mexico, Peru and Bolivia.

Mr. Harvey: This is Mexico too, isn't it?

Mr. Horr: Ah, but it is not the same law,—no use talking.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr, I will bring you the statute at the next session.

Mr. Horr: I wish you would, I would like to see it, and gold is in front of the one you quote. Now I simply wish to say he left off at Peru and Bolivia the following, "of not less than eight hundred and ninety-seven thousandths in fineness, and four hundred grains in weight, at one hundred cents each; and the five franc pieces of France, of not less than nine hundred thousandths in fineness, and three hundred and eighty-four grains in weight, at ninety-three cents each." Now that did not make all the silver coin of those countries legal-tender as he said they were, and if he had printed the whole law there would not be a chance to deceive the people on that subject, and if my point is not well taken I don't know when a point is made out.

Now I call your attention next: On page 10 you say on account of the scarcity of silver both Jefferson and Jackson recommended that dimes, quarters and halves

would serve the people better than dollars until more silver bullion could be obtained. This was the reason why only about eight millions of the eight hundred and five millions of silver was coined into dollars. You gave it that it was on account of the scarcity of the silver. When you got over to the 18th page of your book you must have forgotten what you had said on page 10—I know folks do that sometimes, it cannot be helped—because you there give the table from Mullhall, the London statistician, in which you show silver was not scarce at that time. You show it was with one exception the most plentiful that it had been at any one time during the experience of the government. Now I don't know why you should have said that, when if you had turned to the mint reports of the United States for 1893, page 88, you could have found out just why they stopped the coinage of the silver dollar, and then you would not have written that it was on account of the scarcity of silver, and then in the next paragraph, or a few afterward, showed there was not any scarcity. You would also have found another reason for the action which was ample in itself. The director of the mint says, page 88, "No issue of silver dollars was made from the mint from 1805 to 1836, the coinage having been suspended by the direction of President Jefferson, owing to the fact"—now mark—"that their bullion value being greater than their face value they were purchased for export. The order of suspension is contained in the following letter under date of May 1, 1806, addressed to the director of the mint at Philadelphia by James Madison, Secretary of State:

"Department of State, May 1, 1806. Sir:—In consequence of a representation from the director of the bank of the United States that considerable purchases have been made of dollars coined at the mint, for the pur-

pose of exporting them, and as it is probable that further purchases and exportations will be made, the President directs that all the silver to be coined at the mint shall be of small denominations so that the value of the largest pieces shall not exceed half a dollar."

I admit, although I don't claim it is a matter of any great importance, that my friend was mistaken as to the reason why Jefferson stopped the coinage of the silver dollar,—he may state a reason that seems to him a good one, but he didn't give the one that Jefferson, through his Secretary of State, gave himself, and I am inclined to think that Jefferson knew why he did it full as well as you do, Brother Harvey, and especially as you go on and prove that the reason you give was not true and could not be true.

I shall now be ready to take up the law of 1873 when you get ready.

MR. HARVEY: I am now ready to answer Mr. Horr as to the statute he has claimed is misquoted there. Mr. Horr, will you please open now "Coin's Financial School" at that disputed statute?

MR HORR: Ready.

MR. HARVEY: "And be it further enacted, that from and after the passage of this act, the following foreign silver coins shall pass current as money within the United States and be receivable by tale, for the payment of all debts and demands at the rates following; that is to say, the Spanish pillar dollars, and the dollars of Mexico, Peru and Bolivia." That is as far as the quotation goes.

MR. HORR: Read the rest.

MR. HARVEY: That is as far as I quoted. You said I misquoted it.

MR. HORR: I did not. I never claimed you quoted it wrong at all, I claimed that you did not quote all of it.

Let me see the book, please. (Laughter and applause.) Here (referring to the book), that has gold in the first section, just as I told you, and that is the one I read from, and that is what you said had no gold connected with it.

Mr. Harvey: I said I quoted it correctly. Section 2 is as I read it in the book. What appears in another section I don't care about.

Mr. Horr: I shall appeal to the notes of the reporter that you said the one you quoted from had no gold connected with it, if I remember rightly.

Mr. Harvey: I understood Mr. Horr to say that in making the quotation I had omitted the word gold.

Mr. Horr: Not at all, I never said any such thing.

Mr. Harvey: This is a great question we are debating, affecting the welfare of 65,000,000 of people, and the trifling away of words and time by a quarrel introduced here over trifling matters that do not affect the principles we are discussing one way or the other indicates upon the part of the other side a lack of appreciation of the question involved. (Applause.)

Now, briefly to satisfy him, about Jefferson: I said that Jefferson ordered the coins made into small coins to better serve the people, and on account of the scarcity of silver—both silver and gold were scarce then—there was abundant silver in the world as compared with gold, thirty to one, but it was not in the United States. (Applause.) Here in the United States silver was scarce. Jefferson was a patriot and a statesman. He understood these little wants of the people as they are not understood now.

I am now ready to proceed with the argument of demonetization, and I have already preceded Mr. Horr while being detained on these minor questions with him; I will now let him proceed further before I do.

THE ACT OF 1873 AGAIN.

MR. HORR: We now come to the discussion of the law which changed this nation from a bimetallic nation to a single standard nation, the law of 1873, which Brother Harvey kindly names a "crime." It has been called that so long that there is nothing novel in the name.

I purpose to show you during this discussion that no law has ever been passed by the American Congress which was freer from taint, which was more carefully examined, which was more completely and fully understood, than the law of 1873. The statement which he read to you that the scheme was concocted in London is a simple assertion upon which he cannot produce one scintilla of reputable truth, not one word. It has been a good many years since England dictated the legislation of this country. They have had trouble to do it ever since 1776. (Laughter.) They would experience as much difficulty now as they did then if they should attempt it. The law of 1873 had its origin, as all such laws have, in the brains of experts. The question of coinage, mintage, is a most intricate one; it is one of the most complicated problems with which philosophical men have ever grappled. It has been a process of development from the earliest stages of humanity down to the present time, which has given us the perfect system of money, though not perfect, as perfect as it has come to be, at this time. The whole thing is a matter of slow growth; the whole question is one that has been studied with great care; it has been studied by men who have devoted their lives to the question. No man in the United States has ever yet given the subject the amount of study that it has received at the hands of European gentlemen, if perhaps I except my friend Warner and Brother Harvey. It is a question, as I stated before,

that is a complicated one, and usually it has been decided by a few men who have studied the problem laboriously, and if anybody will read the reports of the Confederate Congress of the United States—the one that came immediately after the Colonial Congress—if they will read the history of those times they will find that all the men who even assumed to be able to discuss the matter intelligently could be counted on the fingers of my two hands. At their head stood Hamilton, the Morrises, Jefferson and Gallatin, no doubt about it, and they shaped the first mintage law of the United States. And so complicated was the question that no two of those patriots—they were all patriots, those gentlemen—no two of them agreed about any one feature of the measure when they first commenced discussing it; they finally came to a sort of compromise and agreed upon the law of 1792 about which we have been talking so much yesterday and a little to-day. In 1834 the law as to mintage was changed in a material matter for the first time; it was done by decreasing the amount of gold in the gold dollar. It was done—if the men who did it are able to tell why they did it—because experience showed those people that gold would not circulate under the ratio of 15 to 1. The cheaper dollar, which was silver, had driven the gold currency out of the United States,—I don't know that any one disputes that, I know that the history of that legislation bears me out in stating that that, and that only, was the reason for changing the ratio between the two metals. It was done for the purpose of getting some gold currency into the United States. Benton said so, they all said so, and the dispute, as I said yesterday, in the discussions of that Congress was entirely upon that question as to whether they should change the ratio from 1

to 15, so low as to make it take 16 ounces of silver for one of gold. Several members of that Congress insisted that if that was done silver would leave the country and that we would be doing business very soon upon a gold basis and with gold currency only. But it was done, and, as those men predicted, silver ceased to be the measure of values in the United States. I don't say, Mr. Harvey, "ceased to be the legal measure." It was lawful to use the silver dollar after that the same as before, but I say the people refused to use the silver dollar in making payments. Why? Simply because they could sell the silver dollar and get more gold dollars for a quantity of silver dollars than the face of the silver dollars called for, and so a man with the least grain of common sense sold his silver, paid his debt and pocketed the balance. Brother Harvey in his books says the coin was worth 2½ per cent, the silver, away down to 1873, 2½ or 2 cents on the dollar,—more anyway than gold. They changed the ratio then and it was not changed again until perhaps 1853,—am I right, 1853?

When they passed a law providing for the subsidiary coinage of silver, that law was intended to keep the silver currency, the little change money, in this country. Up to that time the silver quarters and dimes were just as good as the silver dollar, and when I was a boy many is the time I have seen the silversmiths of the United States melting down the quarters and dimes of the United States because they could get their silver cheaper that way than they could by buying the bullion. That depleted us, destroying the small change of the United States, and the remedy was a simple one. It had already, as I remember it, been adopted by England; it has since been adopted by nearly all the civilized nations of the world, and lately Japan has adopted it. If I am right I

don't know but she would now be called civilized since a few weeks ago. (Laughter.) The way they managed to keep it in circulation in this country was by putting less silver into the silver coin, that is in the half dollar, quarter dollar and the dime, a less proportion than was to be in the regular standard dollar, and they made the coin so small that no one could afford to send it out of the country, nor could smiths afford to melt it, because then they could not get silver as cheap as to buy the bullion, and in that way they kept our subsidiary silver coin in circulation in the United States. Now I have given this simply, Mr. Harvey, because it explains one of the provisions that crept into the law of 1873 during its progress through Congress.

HOW TO DETECT A CRIMINAL.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr says that I have no proof that the scheme was concocted in London to demonetize silver in the United States. When I was a boy I went into a courthouse one day to hear a criminal trial, and I heard a lawyer say, "When a crime is committed and you want to detect the criminal, look for the man that is benefited by the crime." (Applause.) Reasoning by induction will more invariably locate the criminal than any uncertain human testimony. Silver was demonetized in England, and in England only, prior to the day it was demonetized in this country. That was where the movement started,—that is another evidence. London bankers initiated the Paris conference of 1867, at which Mr. John Sherman was present, therefore I have the right to say the conspiracy originated in London.

Mr. Horr says that the science of money is hard to understand. Ever since the money-lenders of the world

shackled the people of the world they have taught the people that money was hard to understand (applause); that it is one of those difficult things, as Mr. Horr once said in a speech, "It gives me the headache to think of it" (laughter); and you are not competent to study it or understand it, and as long as they can make you believe that, they have you in their power, as this debate later will disclose. You who study chemistry and can understand the most difficult problems of science, —chemistry and other sciences that would make a banker's head dizzy to contemplate; you, we are told, cannot understand the simple proposition of money, that which you come into the use of every day. Mr. Horr has only taught in this debate a proposition that it is the interest of every selfish money-lender in the world to advocate, and he is here advocating it. (Applause.)

In 1873 when this treacherous act was passed there was no specie currency in this country. During all the years from 1792 to 1861, when it was actually in use and being tested for its merit, no one proposed to demonetize either of the metals, except some money-lenders from Europe who proposed it in 1854. (Applause.) But at that time, 1873, when it was not in circulation and was not needed, the movement was begun and consummated. And as one congressman said when the bill was offered in Congress, "We are not using gold and silver as money, have not yet considered an act for the resumption of specie payment, and the introduction of this bill at the present time either means a trick or is a farce worthy of being caricatured by Thomas Nast," and yet Mr. Horr goes back and argues a change made in 1834, to show you why Congress was solicitous about this matter at the time when we were not using gold and silver at all.

I again caution the reader that all discussion by Mr. Horr of ratios, as he threw in a few moments ago, belongs in the second chapter of "Coin's Financial School," and when we get there it will be time enough to argue it, and when we do it will not be such an abstruse science as to give a man a headache to understand it. (Applause.)

QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE.

This closed the debate for the day; and questions being in order the first was by Mr. H. L. Bliss to Mr. Harvey: "The total coinage of silver by the Philadelphia mint up to 1873 amounted, in round numbers, to $105,000,000; that of all the mints, to $143,000,000. You said that the Treasury had changed its figures and that you compelled it to do so. Did you not make the blunder of taking the coinage of the Philadelphia mint for the total coinage? Is it true that the Treasury has changed its figures?"

Mr. Harvey: My answer is: First, that I did not say that I had forced them to change it,—or to correct any mistake; and next, that the list, table of coins, from which the $105,000,000 was figured when "Coin's Financial School" was written, was before me in a report of the director of the mint. I don't know now whether there were separate tables or not. Since then, in their later books, the one last out, it is all in one table, and my impression was that the one the "School" was calculated from was in one table. So that I can not tell, Mr. Bliss, whether the mistake was made by taking the Philadelphia mint or not, but I did state the amount at $37,000,000 less silver coined before 1873 than was really coined, and, at the same time, it was to the interest of my argument to state it at all it would stand.

The next question was by O. B. Gunn, of Kansas City. "Mr. Harvey asserts that the mints were open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver from 1792 to 1873. Jefferson closed the mints in 1806 for the coinage of the silver dollar, and only 1,300 of Mr. Harvey's dollars or units of value were coined up to 1840, a period of thirty-four years. Was this free and unlimited coinage of silver?"

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Jefferson did not close the mints, that could only be done by an act of Congress. Mr. Jefferson directed (the mints being open to the free coinage of all kinds of silver coin) for the mint director to coin the silver that came, at the option of the people in fifty cent pieces and less. It made no difference to the people who brought it whether they coined it in fifty cent pieces or dollars, it was all money. The mints were open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, but the director of the mint, or President, might direct what kinds of coins should be coined without interfering with the principle of law that the mints were open to free and unlimited coinage. (Applause.) The number of units coined in no way affects the substance of the unit being the measure of value. You need not coin a single unit, and yet, by law, the $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains of silver could be the unit of value regulating all other coins, all compared to it in legal and commercial ratio. The act of 1873 made the gold dollar the unit, and now, by act of September 15, 1889, it is unlawful to coin a gold dollar. So that we now have a unit of $23\frac{2}{10}$ grains of gold, and Congress has said that the mints shall not coin any of them. But, nevertheless, we have a gold standard, because the five dollar gold pieces and ten dollar gold pieces are coined with reference to $23\frac{2}{10}$ grains of gold being the unit of value. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: The first question I have is by James Bolinger. I see he asks us both to answer it. I will answer it and then pass it to Mr. Harvey. "Why is it I have had so little silver or gold since the passage of the act of 1873?" is his question.

It is impossible for me to tell, unless I know how you have been behaving since 1873. (Applause.)

Mr. Harvey: My answer to it is, because we have been on a gold standard. (Long-continued applause.)

Mr. Horr: The next question is from Mr. Motsinger, of Sholes, Indiana. "Was it not right that under the so-called bimetallic laws which existed previous to 1873, when one precious metal increased in exchange value, that the debtor had, through the legal-tender provision, the option of paying in the metal which had not increased in exchange value?"

It was not only proper, but perfectly natural, and the only way that a man who had any sense would pay. It was a legal right that every one, in his right mind, would take advantage of.

The other question was by H. S. Taylor. "Did not Thomas Jefferson, in making report to Congress in 1806, quote the report of the director of the mint to the effect that a great increase in coinage of fractional silver was made at the special request of bankers, because of a demand for fractional coin, and to prevent the exportation of silver?"

Mr. Horr: I would say this, Mr. Taylor, that I do not know whether he did or did not. If anybody will show me the report that says he did and it is authentic, I will agree to it. I have never, myself, had my attention called to it. It was not the reason that the Secretary of State, under his direction, gave for suspending the coinage of the standard silver dollar. If the small

change was scarce, and the banks had requested Mr. Jefferson to stop the dollar coinage, and coin the small money because they needed that the most, I should have considered it patriotic in him to have acceded to their wishes. He did not give it to the Secretary of State as one of his reasons, but he may have had such reason, I don't know.

Question by E. D. Stark of Cleveland, to Mr. Horr: "Do you now think, in view of all that has transpired since, that it was a good thing in 1873 to have gone to a gold standard for this country?"

Mr. Horr: Without any question, it was the only safeguard for the people of this nation and the business interests of this country. (Long and enthusiastic applause.)

Question by Mr. L. G. Powers to Mr. Harvey: "Was there ever a report of the director of the mint that did not contain separate statements of the coinage of the Philadelphia mint, and also a summary of the coinage of all mints, and did the director of the mint ever make a mistake as has been said by you?"

Mr. Harvey: My answer is, as I understand it, the coins are reported in separate tables from the separate mints, and that in another book issued officially from Washington we get them all combined in one table. As to mistakes being made by the director of the mint, mistakes are made in all official tables produced at Washington more or less. Where you deal in so many figures it is utterly impossible to get out a book without getting mistakes in it; they say at Washington, and I agree with them, that it is utterly impossible. The only question is to get them as near right as possible, and where a mistake does not affect the principle that is being examined, it is not regarded as a material mistake.

The further hearing of the debate was adjourned to 10 o'clock Thursday.

CHAPTER IV.

THE THIRD DAY. THE LEGISLATION OF 1873.

THE hour for opening the debate having been changed to 10 A. M., it was promptly at this hour that Judge Miller, one of the two judges, rapped for order. The buzz of conversation in the audience immediately ceased and Mr. Horr began the debate.

MR. HORR: Previous to entering upon a discussion of the law of 1873, I desire to state something as to my personal relations in this debate, because my opponent yesterday stated:

"Mr. Horr has only taught in this debate a proposition that is in the interest of every selfish money-lender in the world to advocate, and he is here advocating it."

That is a part and parcel of the method usually adopted by the advocates of free silver for the purpose of creating a prejudice against every person who has honest convictions upon the other side of this question. I say to my opponent now I am not a money-lender, I have not a dollar's interest in any banking institution or American corporation, or any other corporations on the face of the earth. I have spent my entire life in working for a living; all the early part of that life was spent in hard work on a small farm; I commenced working for myself at ten dollars a month; there is hardly any kind of hard manual labor in which I have not at some time in my life engaged; consequently my sympathies are with people who live by toil. I can meet a dude on the streets and pass him by

without any peculiar sensation. I never meet a man digging in a trench but what I feel like taking off my hat and saluting him, because I once dug ditches for a living. I can pass by a railroad president, the superintendent of Pullman cars, without any emotion, but I never meet a brakeman or a baggageman without feeling kindly toward him, because for months I was brakeman on a freight train night and day, and my promotion to a baggagemaster was one of the proudest moments of my life. (Applause.) From my boyhood up I have lived, or tried to, on what I earned, and consequently I come into this debate for the purpose of defending the interests, as my friend will learn before I finish it, of the men who live by honest toil. (Applause.) I admit that at present I am employed by a large newspaper corporation of the United States; if it will do him any good I will admit that they pay me every day for my work more than I used to get for two months' hard labor—am I to blame for that? My policy has always been, "Take any job you can get so as to get an honest living, and never refuse to take a better one whenever the chance is offered you." (Applause.) Is that wrong? I have another motto, too, that whenever I am laboring for a person or corporation I am a good deal more anxious to earn all or more than I get than I am to be worrying round about crowding up my wages. My experience has been that if I do good work they will recognize my merits and pay me for it, and that is all I have any right to ask for in this world.

Now having stated this I desire to say to my friends, I have no prejudice against men who have been more fortunate than myself, and who have accumulated money where I have not. I do not think that a man becomes a scoundrel necessarily because he saves a part of what

he earns. I have been in every corner, every nook of the state in which my friend was born; the hills and the valleys of West Virginia are familiar to me; I have traveled through her sheep-growing counties, been in her mines and her lumber camps, I have learned something of her people. I do not think it is anything against a man if he even becomes a stockholder in a national bank,—I am informed, Brother Harvey, that your father is fortunate enough to own stock in the Kanawha National Bank; am I right about that?

MR. HARVEY: No, sir, he does not.

MR. HORR: Did he ever?

MR. HARVEY: Never did.

MR. HORR: Well, it wouldn't hurt him if he had, would it?

MR. HARVEY: No, sir.

MR. HORR: He could own stock in the bank and still keep honest, couldn't he?

MR. HARVEY: Yes.

MR. HORR: A man could be successful in life without creating in me any spirit of envy. I have learned that men who accumulate money and then invest it in building up great industries for the benefit of the people who earn wages bless this nation; and any system which injures them necessarily injures the people who live by daily toil. Consequently I am just as zealous in my efforts to prevent financial disaster to the business men of this nation as I am to see to it that the wages of the working men are not cut in two by using a debased and depreciated measure of values. (Applause.) When you divide the unit of measure, the value of it, into two pieces, and make them take the half for the whole, you have injured them in a way that is beyond computation. With these remarks I shall

now wait for Brother Harvey and will then proceed to the investigation of the bill of 1873.

NO PERSONAL REFLECTION INTENDED.

Mr. Harvey: Yesterday Mr. Horr undertook to impress on you how difficult it was for anybody to understand the science of money except—the inference was, bankers. I criticised that by calling your attention to the fact that that impression had been attempted to be made upon the minds of the people through all the history of money, and that it had assisted them in causing the people to abandon a consideration of their financial system and leave it to these people who were enriching themselves by it, and who would make it to suit their interests. Therefore, it was to their interest to make you believe that you knew nothing about it, and never would know anything about it. (Applause.) I then added that you (Mr. Horr) were here repeating that poisonous argument. I did not mean to criticise Mr. Horr personally. That he was an advocate of a pernicious principle did not mean that Mr. Horr himself was a bad man. This great question is not going to be decided by the American people by any advocate parading himself before them as having been a horny-fisted working man at one time in his life. (Long-continued applause.) I do not object to Mr. Horr giving the evolution of his life. I do think it was a little unfair to have omitted that in that evolution he finally became a bank president; that statement should have gone with the balance in the play to popular favor. I do not deny that Mr. Horr and numerous selfish bank presidents have at one time been toilers of the soil. The minds and character of men are molded only in part by their early associations. As they grow older in

this feverish age, where money has been erected as a god, selfish motives make them climb from one place to another until it has become a proposition that a man can win in this world only by his ability to make money. And the fact that a man is raised on a farm and afterward gets into the whirlpool of city life among capitalists and corporations and becomes the employé of corporations, even at wages equivalent in each day to two months' salary of a working man, we are not to be blamed for believing that his character is molded by subsequent events in his life.

Mr. Horr and numerous employés of newspaper corporations and other corporations are in part, many of them, representing their honest convictions, and I accord that to the honorable gentlemen from New York. Many of them never stop to analyze the question, the great principle, that must make or unmake the republic in which they live. It is only a question of salary that they consider. (Applause.) You say that a man should better himself, and, if a better salary is offered him, take it. Not for all the combined salaries in the world would I accept a position where I would have to advocate a principle that I thought would destroy the liberties of my countrymen. There is something in this life greater than money. (Applause.) When we again get the American people to believe this, and not till then, can we again have liberty in this land, and every man have an opportunity to make a living without being deprived of it by the aggregations of selfish interests. (Long-continued applause.) Far rather would I leave to my children a country in which they could live and be happy and have equal rights with all other people's children than to accept the wealth of this world, and in my closing days of life feel that I had assisted

in implanting upon this government the usages of the monarchies of the old world, and in my after-death dreams could see them toiling as virtual slaves, suffering physically and mentally by reason of legal rights that gave other men the power to own all the money and all the land and all those privileges through which man might travel for days and weeks and find no opportunity to exercise his talents.

The value of the debate yesterday was in this. A studied misrepresentation has gone before the people of the United States that there was only $8,000,000 of silver coined by the United States Government prior to 1873. Now, meeting face to face with a representative of the other side of the question, this debate now carries to the people of the United States the admitted fact that there was $143,000,000 of silver coined prior to 1873.

MR. HORR: In reference to my having been a bank president, I omitted it not because I was ashamed of the fact. It is true that at one time I had saved what we in some places—not in this city—would call a competency, and I was a president of a national bank. In the crash of 1873 I went down, what I had saved was swept from under me. My position as president of the bank I resigned; but I did not steal any money of the bank, not a dollar. I went into the world again single-handed, and went to work, and while putting in logs in the northern part of Michigan I was nominated for Congress and sent there, served six years of my life and did the hardest work I ever did during those six years. I came out of Congress just as poor as I went in, I couldn't come out any poorer, it was an impossibility. (Laughter.)

HOW THE LAW OF 1873 ORIGINATED.

I now propose to take up this question of the origin of the law of 1873, which our silver friends denounced as a crime. That bill first originated a little before the year 1870. It was drafted after consulting a large number of experts—and, by the way, I want to say one word right here about experts; men who have spent their lives studying a question are apt to know a little more about it than those who have never studied it at all. In the first day of our discussion Brother Harvey went back on his baby theory and told us that babes did not mean babes at all, that it meant pure and undefiled people; but now he returns to his old motto and claims that money really is so simple a thing that babes can understand it, or that people who have not studied it can learn all about it; and he is facetious because I have stated that the question has given me the headache. (Laughter.) I did state that. But, mark you, Brother Harvey, it was the study of the question that made my head ache, not writing such stuff as is in this book. That would not give any man the headache. (Laughter.) That kind of superficial nonsense does not tax the brains of a man, it is the real study of the question that gives one the headache.

Now this bill was prepared after submitting the question to a large number of experts all over the United States. We had never had a revision of the mint laws for a great number of years, and the men in charge of the mint thought that the time had come when something should be done. Among the men who were consulted upon the question were Mr. Boutwell, the secretary of the treasury; Mr. Knox, deputy comptroller of the currency; Mr. Linderman, the director of the mint; Mr. Parsons, superintendent of the mint at Philadel-

phia. The plan was submitted to these gentlemen and a large number of others for the establishment of a new system of mintage, and yet the free silver papers of this country—and my friend here has done it in his own books—intimate that this law must have been wicked because it was attached onto the revision of the mint laws. Why, that is where it belonged. That was the place to find it. Now was there anything secret about it? I deny that it had its origination in England, or London, or anywhere except in the brains of the people who were looking after the coinage interests of the United States. And I defy Mr. Harvey, not by assertion, to prove one single item that had any reference to the British people controlling or directing this matter.

After a correspondence with a large number of these experts upon mints and coinage, the bill was framed, and, with the correspondence, was submitted to Congress in the most complete form and with an elaborate report from Mr. Knox, which explained all its provisions. Every step taken in the incipiency of this measure was as open as the light.

I am now reading from my own articles, and consequently I use them without quotations. Thousands of copies of the bill were sent broadcast to all parts of the country. The *Bankers' Magazine*, in its number of July, 1870, printed this report of Mr. Knox and commented on the same. The bill prepared by Mr. Knox was endorsed by Secretary Boutwell of the treasury and transmitted to the Senate on April 25, 1870. The bill as it was at that time drafted, dropped the dollar silver coin of the United States and changed the unit of value. That was in the original bill as it was sent to the Senate with a letter from the Secretary. Now nobody tried to cover up that fact. In this report of Mr. Knox were

found all the letters of these different experts to whom had been sent a draft of the bill, and who had been asked for their opinion upon it. Those letters were all printed by order of the Senate in connection with the carefully prepared report of Mr. Knox.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr, permit me. Have you that bill and those letters with you?

Mr. Horr: I have not them here to-day, but I have them in the city, I think.

Mr Harvey: Will you produce them during the debate?

Mr. Horr: I will if I have them; I don't know whether I brought them with me, but I think I did.

Mr. Patterson wrote to Mr. Knox, and his letter was printed in the public documents, for I will say to this house that every single document I have referred to I copied from the books of the government in the city of Washington, myself individually, so I know what I am talking about. Mr. Patterson said: "The silver dollar, half-dime and three cent pieces are dispensed with by this amendment Gold becomes the standard money, of which the gold dollar is the unit. Silver is subsidiary, embracing coins from the dime to the half dollar."

Can anything be more plain than that? Was there any covering up of anything in that letter?

Mr. Harvey: In the interrupted presentation of demonetization I had called the attention of the people to the condition, morally, of Congress at the time of the passage of the act. I had referred to impeachment charges against Vice-President Colfax in 1873 for fraud in connection with legislation; to the resignation of Secretary of War Belknap for bribery, 1873. I now proceed, after first stating for Mr. Horr's information, that

Del Mar, the English historian, says that the act of 1816, demonetizing silver in England, had a clause in it that it might be reinstated by the king; that that clause, giving a right to reinstatement, was repealed in 1871, and that the act in which it was repealed was within two weeks in the hands of Mr. Knox, the Comptroller of the United States Treasury (applause), and was in part the basis of the act in this country.

Now I proceed with this argument as to what occurred in Congress, and I shall pass the books to Mr. Horr. I will give page references so the readers of this debate can check on me. There will be no uncertainty as to anything that I say being authentic. I will quote nothing that is not here present in the room. By examining the records of the day and the newspapers we find that there was an era of corruption in Congress at that time. Clinton Colgate confessed before the Ways and Means Committee of 1873, to the use of money to influence the incorporation of special features in the internal revenue bill, testifying among other things, that Charles Sherman of Ohio, a brother of Senator Sherman, had been paid $10,000 by the New York Stock Exchange, in connection with the Revenue Bill. The officials of the Stock Exchange were subpœnaed and the facts developed that while the money had not been paid, Judge Sherman had rendered a bill to the Exchange for his services, and, as he claimed, for securing the services of his brother, Senator Sherman, to put the bill through. (Applause.) Colgate, when he testified, knew of the transaction and supposed the bill had been paid. As Judge Sherman was then a United States District Judge, the Ways and Means Committee turned the whole matter over to the Judiciary Committee, directing it to take action looking to his im-

peachment, and I stop right here to read a letter of Judge Sherman to a member of the Stock Exchange of New York [page 2125, number 3 Appendix, third session XLIInd Congress, Congressional Globe].

"Judge's Room, United States Court,
Northern District of Ohio.
Cleveland, March 27, 1872.

"DEAR SIR:—I wrote you yesterday on my return from an absence of some time in too feeble terms, of my feelings as regards the death of your father, yet as the mortal moves on, so, though we never shall forget him, yet business must be attended to. Last summer at the instance of your father I attempted to have such a construction placed upon the Internal Revenue laws as would relieve the bankers from the payment of a heavy tax. There was a partial success, but such a boasting, or rather publicity given to it that the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury was called to it and he forbid the order to be issued. There was then no remedy but in Congress. I so suggested to your father. He then wrote me the enclosed letter.

Upon the authority and in consideration of what was said in it I went to work: Had interviews with Mr. Boutwell, with John Sherman, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, with General Garfield and other prominent members of Congress, and the result was that it became the policy of the administration to repeal not only the tax in question, but the stamp and other obnoxious taxes. I think this result was brought about by discussions raised and influences used by me. The taxes are not yet repealed, but they are certain to be so within the next sixty days. If your father was living there would be no necessity of asking about it, but as the agreement was made through him I fear there may arise a misunderstanding, and therefore ask you to inquire into it and ascertain whether the committee of the Stock Exchange still recognize the contract. If they do it is all right and I will still continue my labors. Let me hear from you at your earliest convenience. Please preserve the letter."

(Meaning the letter that reflected the contract.)

That is signed by C. T. Sherman, brother of John Sherman. It would readily exhaust the words of this debate to go into all the investigations of that notorious Congress.

MR. HORR DEFENDS CONGRESSMEN.

MR. HORR: Before proceeding with the history of this bill I desire to say one word, and that is this: The attempt of Mr. Harvey to smirch the Congress of the United States and make the people of this country, believe that the members of Congress in this country as a rule, are corrupt and have been subject to purchase and sale, can be characterized only as infamous. (Applause.) No nation on the face of the earth ever had a purer set of legislators than have been in the Congress of this country during its existence. There sit before me several members of Congress who served with me in several Congresses, and I appeal to each and every one of them if during their entire service they ever saw or mistrusted that money was being used to purchase members of Congress. I served six years without ever knowing that an instance of that kind had occurred during the Congresses in which I served. When men start out with the proposition that in order to prove their case they must also prove that the majority of the best men of this country are thieves and scoundrels, they had better stop before they begin. (Applause.) The people of this country—and the congressman is no exception—as an average are upright, honest business men. I admit that Judge Sherman was guilty of a crime. That was never in any way connected with his brother, John Sherman, and you know it. They exonerated him.

Mr. Harvey: Did they impeach Judge Sherman?

Mr. Horr: Judge Sherman resigned immediately, they drove him from the bench. (Applause.) The public opinion of this country would not permit a man to hold a public position who would do a thing of that kind. But what has that to do with the question whether Mr. Knox openly and squarely presented this bill to Congress? Mr. Knox said himself, "The coinage of the silver dollar piece, the history of which is here given, is discontinued in the proposed bill. It is by law the dollar unit"—you read that yesterday—"and assuming the value of gold to be 15½ times that of silver, being about the mean ratio for the last six years, it is worth in gold a premium of about 3 per cent, its value being $1.03 12-100 and intrinsically more than 7 per cent premium in our other silver coin, its value thus being $1.07 43-100. The present laws consequently authorize a gold dollar unit and a silver dollar unit differing from each other in intrinsic value. The present gold dollar piece is made the dollar unit in the proposed bill, and the silver dollar was discontinued."

A voice in the audience: When was that written?

Mr. Horr: Just before it was sent to Congress in 1870. It was a part of the report that Secretary Boutwell sent to the Senate in the spring of 1870. It accompanied the bill and was printed in the public documents as being an explanation of the bill by order of the Senate. Is there anything hidden in those statements?

Now Mr. Sherman was chairman of the Finance Committee. This bill went immediately to his committee. He said only in August of 1893 as follows:

"Mr. President: The Finance Committee carefully examined that bill; we were not in any hurry about it; it was sent to us in April, 1870. In December, 1870, the Committee on Finance, after a careful examination, after having the bill printed and sent by order of

the Senate to every one who desired to read it or look over it, reported it unanimously. That committee was composed of Messrs. Sherman, Williams of Oregon, Cattell, Warner, Fenton and Bayard. The bill was reported to the Senate, December 19, 1870, after lying in our committee room eight months. The nature of the bill I have already described. The dollar was dropped from the coinage of the bill framed in the Treasury department. No one proposed to re-issue it. The Pacific Coast had six intelligent, able and competent senators on the floor, representing a population of not more than a million then, if that. They would have carefully looked out for the interests of silver if the bill affected them injuriously, but the silver dollar at that time was worth more than the gold dollar. California and Nevada were on the gold standard. As I said, the bill was printed over and over again and finally reported and brought before the Senate.

"It was debated here for three days, and I have the voluminous record upon the subject. Now the bill came to a vote on the 10th of January, 1871, in the Senate."

It was passed by a "yea and nay vote"—and let me say right here so far as I have been able to discover that is the only yea and nay vote taken during the entire passage of this bill, which ran along for nearly three years. Now mark, "the senators from the Pacific slope, including Senator Stewart, of Nevada, voted for the bill, and Senator Sherman voted against it." Mr. Sherman tells us that he did not vote against it because it struck out the silver dollar, but because it compelled the government to pay the expense of coinage, and he thought the people who owned the gold and silver bullion should pay that expense. Now up to that time had there been any secrecy? The bill was sent from the Senate to the House; and on January 13, 1871, on motion of William D. Kelley, the bill was ordered to be printed. February 25, 1871, Mr. Kelley, who was at

that time chairman of the committee on Coinage, reported the bill back with an amendment which was in the nature of a substitute. It was again printed and again sent back to the committee. The fifty-first congress died by constitutional limitation a few days after the bill had thus been reported and without any action upon it by the House. That ended the effort to pass that bill in that congress. Now I will submit to Mr. Harvey or any one else if there was anything but the most open, fair effort to show the people of this country just what that committee proposed to do.

Now on March 9, 1871, there had been already a special session called of another Congress. Mr. Kelley again introduced this bill, and it was ordered to be printed and referred to the commitee on coinage when such committee should be appointed. Nothing further was done about it during that entire extra session.

EVIDENCE OF CORRUPTION IN CONGRESS.

MR. HARVEY: As I proceed—in a connected manner, however—I will fully answer Mr. Horr.

Among the many charges of corruption made at this period—1873—there was one of significance when we consider that silver was demonetized by a single sentence being omitted from the report of the Conference Committee and enrollment of the mint bill, and indicates the power, in this instance, a corrupt clerk could have. George A. Bassett, clerk of the Ways and Means Committee, 1873, was charged with having demanded $250 per month from the bankers and brokers of New York to assist them in repealing the tax on borrowed capital, and $5,000 when the act passed.

In the *Chicago Tribune* of February 21, 1873, an administration paper of that period, now before me on

this table for the inspection of Mr. Horr, a Washington correspondent says:

"As for George A. Bassett, long the clerk of the Ways and Means Committee, the story of the use of his privileges is as old as my residence in this city. I heard complaints made in California that he had demanded payment for services after experiencing unusual hospitality from the corporations there."

This same correspondent in the same issue of this administration paper (the Republican party being then in power), speaking of the situation at Washington, February 21, 1873, the very month in which silver was demonetized, said: "Turkish corruption under the Pashas and Beys, or Russian official rottenness, could scarcely be worse than it is here." (Applause.)

The salary-grab bill was introduced in the House, December 2, 1872, and in the Senate, January 9, 1873. It passed March 3, 1873. It included two years' back salary, and aroused an exclamation of indignation throughout the land. The people rose en masse and forced Congress to repeal this bill, little dreaming at the time that another bill had passed at that Congress that was to rob them of millions of dollars. The people could understand a salary-grab, but they could not understand a scientific spoliation of their rights. (Applause.)

These exposures were followed by general disgust of the people at the neglect of congressmen to prosecute each other, or rather at the disinclination of those innocent to prosecute their guilty fellow-members. It was in this Congress that silver was demonetized. (Applause.) To make plain how the fraud was practiced I copy into my remarks Sections 15 and 21 of the bill as it is supposed to have read when on its passage, together with the words fraudulently omitted in brackets. Omit the words in brackets, and you have these

sections as they now read in the statutes; include the words in brackets, and you have the sections as the bill was supposed to have passed Congress.

Mr. Horr: Where is that from? I don't understand.

Mr. Harvey: I take the two sections as they now appear in the statutes, and I add between brackets the words that were erased from the bill—

Mr. Horr: By whom?

Mr. Harvey: (continuing)—surreptitiously in its passage.

Mr Horr: By whom? What proof have you that anything was erased?

Mr. Harvey: I'll get to the proof of that a little later.

Mr. Horr: Well, let's have it.

PROOF OF FRAUD.

Mr. Harvey: "Section 15. That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade dollar [a standard dollar], a half-dollar, or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five cent piece, a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the trade dollar shall be four hundred and twenty grains Troy [the weight of a standard dollar shall be three hundred and eighty-four grains Troy]; the weight of the half-dollar shall be twelve grams and one-half of a gram; the quarter-dollar and the dime shall be respectively one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar; and said [fractional] coins shall be a legal-tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding five dollars in any one payment.

"Section 21. That any owner of silver bullion may deposit same at any mint, to be formed into bars, or into dollars of the weight of four hundred and twenty grains Troy, designated in this act as trade dollars [or into standard dollars of three hundred and eighty-four grains], and no deposit of silver for other coinage shall

be received; but silver bullion contained in gold deposits and separated therefrom may be paid for in silver coin at such valuation as may be, from time to time, established by the director of the mint."

As the bill passed both houses the unit was on gold, and free and unlimited coinage of both metals was provided for. By it there was free coinage of silver in the standard silver dollar and the trade dollars; fractional silver coins only were to be regulated by the Treasurer at his discretion. But as enrolled the mints were closed to free and unlimited coinage of silver, except as to the trade dollar, afterward abolished. The standard silver dollar was fraudulently omitted after the bill had passed both houses. (Applause.) It will be questioned by our best citizens that such a fraud could be practiced, and the hesitancy with which they accept its truth attests the integrity of our citizenship. Before offering my proof, and I promise you it shall be conclusive, I wish to speak of official crimes.

HISTORY OF THE DEMONETIZATION LAW.

Mr. Horr: I wish to say right here that upon the face of his own bill there is a proof that to any man who has studied this question is conclusive. The whole attempt to prove that any such bill as the one made up with brackets by Mr. Harvey ever went from the House to the Senate is false. Does any man in his senses believe that they ever undertook to give free coinage of silver to a standard dollar of 384 grains? I will proceed with the exact history of this bill as it occurred.

Soon after the meeting of Congress in January, 1872, January 6, the bill was reported by Mr. Kelley, chairman of the committee on coinage, with recommendation that it pass. The bill was read and discussed at length. Mr. Kelley, on the floor of the House during

his remarks—that is in the second Congress, the second time this bill came up in the House—said:

"The Senate took up the bill and acted upon it during the last Congress and sent it to the House. It was referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, and received as careful attention as I have ever known a committee to bestow upon any measure. We proceeded with great deliberation to go over the bill, not only by sections, but line by line and word by word. The bill has not received the same deliberate consideration from the Committee on Coinage of this House, but the attention of each member was brought to it at the earliest day of this session. Each member procured a copy of the bill and there has been a thorough examination of the bill."

Now then, the next day, January 7, 1872, the bill after further discussion was again recommitted, and on February 9, 1872, it was again reported from the Coinage Committee by Samuel Hooper from Massachusetts, and recommitted, sent back to the committee. February 13, 1872, it was again reported by Mr. Hooper with amendments, printed and made the general order for March 12, 1872, until it should be disposed of. April 9, 1872, the bill came up in the House for consideration. Mr. Hooper, who had the bill in charge, made a prepared speech upon it of ten columns and explained the provisions of each section of the bill. He said:

"Section 16 re-enacts the provisions of the existing laws defining the silver coins and their weights respectively." Now mark—"except in relation to the silver dollar, which is reduced in weight from 412½ grains to 384 grains, thus making it a subsidiary coin in harmony with the silver coins of less denomination, to secure its concurrent circulation with them."

Now there can be no doubt, they could not have put that in had their attention not been called to the fact

that the old silver dollar had been dropped. That committee reinstated, not the old dollar, but the one he has been reading about of 384 grains, and made it a subsidiary coin, like all silver coins of the United States. It is simply preposterous for a man to claim for a moment that that committee or any committee would give free coinage to silver dollars of 384 grains. It never was done, they never even dreamed of doing it, and a man who would have proposed it would have stultified himself before the American Congress.

384 grains made it just twice the amount of the subsidiary silver half-dollar which was then being circulated. Congress had already provided that silver for making subsidiary coins should be purchased by the treasurer and paid for by the government, coined and issued to the people. The people were compelled to pay full value for it, and the seigniorage went into the Treasury of the United States. It was purposely made worth less than its face, and in the House Committee they did propose to make the silver dollar also a subsidiary coin, but they did not propose to give it free coinage; they proposed that it should stand like all subsidiary coins, be coined to the profit of the government in the coinage.

Now, "the silver dollar of 412½ grains, by reason of its bullion or intrinsic value, being greater than its nominal value"—this is what Mr. Hooper said—"long since ceased to be a coin of circulation and is melted by manufacturers of silver ware. It does not circulate now in commercial transactions with any country, and the convenience of these manufacturers in this respect can better be met by supplying small stamped bars of the same standard, avoiding the useless expense of coining the dollar for that purpose."

In my next I shall show you that other members said the same, or substantially the same thing, in regard to this bill, which was before the American Congress. The bill was reported just as he says, with a dollar of that kind, but not giving free coinage to that dollar. I deny that anybody ever dreamed of so preposterous a proposition as that. It is simply monstrous, the claim that Mr. Harvey makes.

MR. HARVEY: I pause a moment in the logical arrangement of this argument to reply to Mr. Horr. He says that Judge Kelley, who was chairman of the committee reporting this bill, said in 1872 something indicating that it was an honest measure.

Now, Mr. Horr, I read you from volume 5, part 1, 44th Congress, second session (Congressional Globe, page 170, date December 13, 1876).

Mr. Kelley there says: "Mr. Speaker: I have none of the remarks quoted from me to withdraw. They were not made on the bill demonetizing the standard silver dollar which was passed, and which was a substitute, never read in this House, and, being a substitute, was not the bill to which I had spoken." (Long-continued applause.)

On May 10, 1879, page 1235 (Congressional Record, volume 9, part 1) Mr. Kelley again says:

"In 1872, when I made the remarks which were cited by these gentlemen, and which have been frequently quoted in both houses, and always with an air as much as to say that to convict this man of the crime of having been instructed by the logic of events would forever settle this momentous question, we were not using coin, and no gentleman in either house appears to have appreciated the scope and magnitude of the silver question or to have given it special study. Hence the bill—and I wish the gentlemen to know what that bill was—it was a bill to reorganize the mints, not to revise the coin money of the country, but to re-organize the mints,

and it was passed without allusion in debate to the question of the retention or abandonment of the standard silver dollar.

"I was chairman of the committee that reported the original bill, and I aver on my honor that I did not know the fact that it proposed to drop the standard dollar, and did not learn that it had done it for eighteen months after the passage of the substitute offered by Mr. Hooper, when I disputed the fact and was shown the law." (Applause.)

OFFICIAL CRIMES AGAINST THE PEOPLE.

I now proceed with my argument. I said I wished to speak of official crimes. Secretary of War Belknap committed a crime and confessed it, as have many others in high official life, and it is believed because it is confessed. The percentage of those who confess to those who are otherwise found guilty and punished is probably not to exceed one per cent, and only a small proportion of those corrupted ever are arraigned.

The effect of official bribery on civil liberty as affecting the permanency of governments, and the admitted history of similar corruption in this and other nations, is worth considering.

A few years ago, and within our own recollection, four prominent members of the National Legislature of France were found guilty and sentenced to punishment for accepting bribes to control their votes, in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal.

No people are naturally more tenacious of their liberty than the Irish, yet through the efforts of the unscrupulous diplomat, Lord Castlereagh, English gold, supplemented by royalty's gift of titles, purchased the dissolution of the Irish Parliament.

Since then Home Rule in Ireland has been prevented by the influence of the aristocracy of England "side

tracking" the issue of Home Rule. As long as the dominant power can prevent it, like this financial question with us, from coming to a political issue, either by deceiving the people with party platforms or by preventing an issue from being made up, they can continue to accomplish the work already begun. Home Rule in Ireland is in that condition.

The *Chicago Post* of yesterday, a gold-standard paper, says: "For all political purposes the free-silver dogma is as dead in the United States to-day as the Home Rule doctrine in England. Both are out of the range of practical politics."

You may demonstrate at the ballot box of the *Morning Record* of Chicago that the silver men of this city are two to one of the gold men; you may demonstrate that the farmers almost uniformly in this country are in favor of restoring silver; yet the soaking into the people of such insidious statements as that, telling them it is not an issue—in other words, that they cannot get an opportunity to vote for that which they have a right to vote for—is their method for suppressing popular liberty.

History teaches us that during the period from the Revolution to the end of Queen Anne's reign bribery was practiced openly in the English Parliament. The Speaker of the House of Commons was expelled for bribery, and the great Marlborough could not clear his character from pecuniary dishonesty.

During Walpole's administration there is no doubt that members of Parliament were paid in cash for their votes, and his memorable remark that "every man has his price" has been preserved as a characteristic indication of his method of government.

The Encyclopædia Britannica says:

"Bribery is the administration of a bribe or reward that it may be a motive in the performance of functions for which the proper motive ought to be a conscientious sense of duty. It is difficult to get the Oriental mind to understand how it is reasonable to expect the temptation of a bribe to be resisted, and this has been the main impediment to the employment of a native judiciary or legislature in the British Eastern Empire. In no country, perhaps, is the offense visited with more dire chastisement, when discovered, than in Russia, yet by the concurrent testimony of all who are acquainted with Russian society, not only the official department but the courts of law at this day are influenced by systematic bribery."

Mr. Horr: Mr. Harvey still continues to rest his case upon an attempt to prove that the human family is made up of scoundrels; that there is no such thing as honor among the people of this or any other country.

The infamous statement that every man has his price ought to be branded upon the brow of every man who will quote it in earnest, because it is a lie against humanity. (Long-continued applause.) It is equaled only by the other statement that there is no such thing as virtue among the women of the United States or any other country.

Mr. Harvey: I don't make that statement.

Mr. Horr: That was a motto that nobody but a villain like Aaron Burr ever could have originated, and I am surprised that in the nineteenth century a man will stand up before an American audience and base his case upon the proposition that the people of our grand republic are mostly villains, because I say to you in all candor, the members of Congress are fully up in honesty and decency to the average of the American people. I know it because I have been one myself, you know. (Laughter.)

CONGRESSMAN KELLEY'S RECORD ON THE COINAGE BILL.

But what has all that to do with whether this bill was properly presented and discussed? I am familiar with what Mr. Kelley said afterward, but I am now going to read to you what he said when this bill was up in the House on the report of Mr. Hooper, and Brother Harvey, I call your attention to this fact; it is not a speech that was printed "by leave." This took place right on the floor of the House. If you will ask your colleague, Brother Warner, he will tell you that I am correct; he has had experience as well as myself, on that subject. Whenever you find in a speech a reference to what some man has just said on the floor of the House, a running debate, that is never printed by leave, that is always something that has occurred right then and there; that is, a man could not get leave to print, and then put in something that never occurred—they did that in Coin's book, but they cannot in the American Congress. (Applause.)

Mr. Stoughton, also a member of the Committee on Coinage, made a long speech upon that bill. He said:

"The silver dollar as now issued is worth for bullion three-and-a-quarter cents more than the gold dollar, and seven-and-a-quarter cents more than two half-dollars, having a greater intrinsic and nominal value; it is certain to be withdrawn from circulation whenever we return to specie payment, and to be used only for manufacture and exportation as bullion."

Now mark: "This bill provides for making changes in the legal-tender coin of the country and for the substituting as legal-tender coin of only one metal instead as heretofore of two."

Mr. Kelley said during this same debate—and you will mark that that did not occur in a speech under leave to print. No one will claim that.

MR. HARVEY: Do you say that Stoughton's speech was running debate?

MR. HORR: No, I did not; I say that Kelley's was, because he starts right in.

"I wish to ask Mr. Potter if he knows of any government in the world which makes its subsidiary coinage of full value? The silver coin of England is 10 per cent below the value of gold coin, and, acting under the advice of the experts of this country and England and France, Japan has made her silver coinage within the last year 12 per cent below the value of gold coin, and for this reason it is impossible to retain the double standard. The value of gold and silver continually fluctuates; you cannot determine this year what will be the relative value of gold and silver next year. They were 15 to 1 a short time ago; they are 16 to 1 now. Hence all experience has shown that you must have one standard coin which shall be a legal-tender for all others, and then you may promote your domestic convenience by having a subsidiary coinage of silver which shall circulate in a limited value and be redeemable at its face value by your government. But, sir, I again call the attention of the house to the fact that the gentlemen who oppose this bill insist upon maintaining a silver dollar worth 3½ cents more than the gold dollar and 7 cents more than two half-dollars, and that so long as those provisions remain you cannot keep silver coin in the country."

That is Mr. Kelley's speech which he made right on the bill at the time.

Now, May 27, 1872, the bill was again called up by Mr. Hooper, who offered an amendment, and then the bill was passed by a vote of 110 yeas to 12 nays. There was no record of the parties who voted for or against it; it was a vote without calling for the yeas and nays.

Just previous to the passage of the bill Mr. McNeally, who was also a member of the committee that examined this question, said:

"As a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, having carefully examined every section and line of this bill, and generally understanding the subject before us, I am satisfied that the bill ought to pass."

Those were members of the committee that had carefully examined the bill. Now mark you, they had put the silver dollar back as a subsidiary coin. They could not have done that had they not had their attention called to the fact that the original bill had omitted the old standard dollar. You cannot conceive of their doing it without knowing something about what they were doing, consequently there was no secret about it. The bill passed by the House, so far as silver coinage is concerned, was identical with the bill first introduced by Mr. Kelley, with the exception of putting the 384-grained silver dollar into the bill as a subsidiary coin with the halves and quarters and dimes. That was the only difference, and it was precisely in that respect the same as the bill reported by Mr. Knox, or sent to the Senate by Mr. Knox in 1870, with the exception that they had introduced this new subsidiary silver coin of one dollar.

Now, do not forget, this bill which we are told was passed by a trick and that few men knew anything about, is the very bill that I have shown you had been under discussion then for nearly two years in the American Congress.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr criticises me for the history of bribery leading up to the Salary Grab Congress of 1873. I don't mean to say that all congressmen are dishonest, or that the majority of them are. I do not mean to say that all of the members of the Congress of 1872-3 were dishonest. I do say this, that as selfish individuality by aggressiveness accumulates the wealth

of the world, and what is left is fought over by the other people, and as the value of property and means of living in sight is lowered, human character is lowered, and that it has continued on a general average to be lowered since that Congress, and we will only preserve this republic by recognizing and noting the sin that has destroyed all past republics.

The *Chicago Post*, a gold-standard paper, does not agree with Mr. Horr in his philippic of a few moments ago. It says editorially in yesterday's issue:

"The man who should undertake to diagnose the condition of the body politic of this state and city at just this juncture might be inclined to describe it as suffering from an epidemic of dishonesty. The gravest charges are continually made; the most shocking disclosures are hourly threatened. We are told that the serpent's trail can be traced in the higher seats of power, and that his odious slime has trickled down over the whole fabric to its very bottom, everywhere debasing manhood and poisoning civic honor. There is more truth than metaphor in this; and the most deplorable feature of the situation is the tone of flippant pessimistic comment with which such a sorry condition of things is treated by many whose duty as citizens it is to put an end to it." (Applause.)

Mr Horr reads, without giving page—but that makes no difference—of where members of Congress spoke of subsidiary coinage. Now, he has confused you with subsidiary coinage, which means the fractional silver, not the dollar, and where a congressman spoke of subsidiary coins he did not mean the silver dollar that had free access to the mints. Now so much for that. He quotes from Stoughton's speech by reading language that would look as if it included the dollar piece, but Stoughton's speech is one of those "leave to print" speeches that you hear about and that never was spoken

in Congress, and is a part of this plan that was pursued during the period of demonetization.

BRIBERY PAST AND PRESENT.

Now I proceed. Both modern and ancient history give plenty of evidence of the frequent practice of bribery; and yet few are exposed of the thousands who are contaminated by it.

The prophet Samuel, priding himself upon his virtues, said:

"Whom have I defrauded—whom have I oppressed? Or of whose hands have I received any bribe to blind my eyes therewith?"

Amos, denouncing the condition of Israel under Jeroboam, says:

"They afflict the just—they take a bribe—and they turn aside the poor in the gate from their rights."

Nearly twenty-five centuries ago Sophocles, the Greek philosopher, said:

"Nothing in use by man, for power of ill,
Can equal money. This lays cities low,
This drives men forth from quiet dwelling place,
This warps and changes minds of worthiest stamp,
To turn to deeds of baseness, teaching men
All shifts of cunning, and to know the guilt
Of every impious deed."

In the Illinois Legislature in 1857, the city street railway company of Chicago was asking for a renewal of its charter for ninety-nine years. Nearly all the citizens of Chicago were opposed to it and petitioned the Legislature against it. No one expected it would pass in the form it was introduced, as it was virtually a present of millions of dollars to the company. To the surprise of every one it went through. The governor, who was unpurchasable, vetoed it.

An effort at once was exerted to pass it over the gov-

ernor's veto, and the people of Chicago became aroused to the danger of the methods that were being used.

Large committees of the most prominent citizens of Chicago went to Springfield to work with the members of the Legislature against the bill. The experience of one of the committeemen will illustrate that of the others. The first member of the Legislature he spoke to said to him, "How much money is there in it for me if I vote on your side?" The member of the committee referred to is now in this room.

The committee representing the people of Chicago were not prepared to bribe, and the bill was passed over the governor's veto, and is the charter under which the street railway of Chicago to-day, with her nearly two million people, is operated.

The Denver Republican of January 15, 1894, says editorially:

"It is silly for members of the State Senate to affect surprise or indignation over the fact that many laws enacted during the regular session of the Ninth General Assembly were wilfully changed in the process of enrollment. That form of knavery has been practiced for years in the Colorado Legislature, and senators and representatives have always winked at it if they have not actually prompted it. Senators who denounced it on Saturday must have known what was going on last winter or else they must have been as blind as bats. So long as our Legislatures continue to make the committeeships at their disposal the plunder of men and women of known bad character, for personal or political reasons, they must expect that the laws they pass will be tampered with if any rogue has sufficient financial interest in the matter to pay for the dirty work."

And this is what happened in Congress in 1873.

The more recent history of our Congress in connection with the open and flagrant venality of members of the Sugar Trust, by which these men made twenty-five

million dollars in sixty days, is fresh in the minds of all here present, and, with other things, has served to deaden and shock the public conscience. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: My friend still clings to his delusion that there is no such thing as honesty in the world, and he tries to establish it by quoting the facts that the whole of Colorado has gone over to bribery and corruption. He ought to know better than I do. That being a silver State, I would not dare dispute his proposition. (Applause.)

But I do know this, that it is a disgrace to a citizen of Chicago or any other city to stand up before the public and claim that honesty and decency do not exist in the city where he lives. I live in the city of New York; we have a reputation for being pretty well up on that matter of corruption in New York. (Long applause and laughter.) But I come here to learn for the first time that Chicago can discount us every day. Now I say to my friend, frankly, I have no idea but what there has been considerable bad work in New York. I do not think that an exact record of everything that has transpired in all the wards of the city would be very nice reading for the public generally. I presume the same thing exists here in Chicago. Ah! but that does not prove that the great majority of the people in New York and Chicago are not upright, law-abiding, decent members of society. You cannot possibly fix the status of civilization by picking out a few scoundrels and claiming that that is the record of the world.

Suppose Harvey had run across Brother Job, who is mentioned in the Scriptures, at the time he was suffering from sores. You remember he had considerable difficulty with the breaking out of boils—he was in

trouble. Harvey would have looked him over and then gone before the people of Chaldea—for if my history is correct Job was a Chaldean—and he would have told the people of Chaldea that the entire nation was simply one big carbuncle, while the fact is, so far as we know, Job was the only man that was afflicted in that way; at all events his wife had not yet been silenced, for you remember by the record she did considerable talking right on the spot.

Now I protest against this effort to smirch the character of the American people by fixing on a few instances of corruption and then drawing the general proposition that this whole entire republic is nothing but a festering sore of corruption. It is an outrage on the decency of men who are trying to lead pure and upright lives in this country and world of ours.

But now I want to proceed with the question we are debating.

SENATOR SHERMAN'S REPORT.

This bill was then passed and sent over to the Senate, December 16, 1872. Mr. Sherman said—he was the chairman of the committee, and was making a report upon it—

"This bill has in substance passed both houses, except that the Senate bill enlarged and increased the salaries of the officers of the mint. It was passed by the Senate of the last Congress, went to the House, and now, somewhat modified, has passed the House of this Congress."

So that the bill had practically passed both houses of Congress.

"The Senate Committee on Finance propose a modification of only a single sentence, but as it is not the same Congress that passed the bill in the Senate, I suppose it will have to go through the form of a full read-

ing unless the Senate is willing to take it on the statement of the committee, the Senate having already adopted and passed it."

It was the same bill, with the exception that they had put the subsidiary dollar coin into it.

Now, January 7, 1873, almost three years after the bill had been sent to Congress, you see, the bill was again reported with amendments, and again printed. It passed the Senate on January 17, 1873, after a discussion which fills nineteen columns of the Congressional Record. Its provisions were again fully explained; Mr. Sherman in that debate called attention to the fact that the bill provided for the coinage of a silver trade dollar, to accommodate the people of California and others engaged in trade with California—he pointed that fact out, which could not have been done without calling their attention to the very fact which Mr. Harvey says was surreptitiously going on. The simple fact that this bill did provide for a trade dollar, and that that subject was fully discussed, necessarily itself called attention to the other fact that the bill discontinued the silver standard dollar.

Now, remember—this bill was before Congress almost three years; at every stage of it it had provided that the coinage of the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains should be dropped; that the old dollar about which we hear so much, neither in committee nor anywhere else, was ever in that bill during these whole three years, and Congress was aware of the fact; they were informed of it time and time again, and a man stultifies himself who could sit in that Congress and say that he had no way of finding out what was in the bill.

Mr. Knox says in his report:

"The bill was read in full in the Senate several times,

and the record states on January 9, 1872, that it was read in the House. It was undoubtedly read at other times; the bill was printed separately—now mark—eleven times, and twice in reports made by the Comptroller of Currency. It was considered at length by the Finance Committee of the Senate, and one Coinage Committee of the House during five different sessions, and the debates upon the bill in the Senate occupy sixty-six columns of the Globe."

Now the Secretary of the Treasury had already called the attention of the country to this bill several times.

I submit to every candid man whether it is possible to introduce a bill into the American Congress in a more fair, open-handed manner than that in which this bill was introduced. Its provisions were carefully pointed out, first in the report of John J. Knox, the deputy comptroller who prepared the bill. The report was sent to Congress with the draft of the bill. He specifically called attention to the change as to the silver dollar.

In the Committee of the House and the Senate the measure was examined as those members stated, line by line and word by word, and then it was finally passed with the full understanding as to what was being done.

I shall next show you that they knew what they were about.

Mr. Harvey: As to Senator Sherman and the trade dollar, the latter being alone in the bill while it was passing the Senate, Mr. Horr will have to retreat from his position when I reach it.

I want the reader to remember what I now say for a few minutes. As to reading the bill line by line, he is talking about another bill, and not the bill that is on the statute books, as the reading of the record will show. (Applause.)

HOW THE BILL PASSED THE HOUSE.

Now I take up the bill in the House where it passed in May, 1872. In volume 1, 2d session, 42d Congress, page 322, we find Mr. Kelley, chairman of the Committee on Weights and Measures, presenting the bill. He said:

"The House will find the body of the bill to be a well-devised and careful codification of the mint laws, making very few, if any, essential changes except in this."

Now, what was the change? He proceeds:

"There is now a director of the mint at Philadelphia, and there is no more reason why he should supervise the other mints than that the chief officers of the other mints should supervise him."

He then proceeds to explain at length why there should be one superintendent over all the mints, to insure a uniformity in the coins struck from them. This was the only change in the old law and in the "careful" codification of the laws then in existence.

The gold unit clause does not appear to have been sprung up to this time. I do not mean to say that Judge Kelley cannot be proven false in his statement by copies of bills afterward fraudulently altered and substituted for the original, and by speeches that were never spoken in the House, but printed in the record under "leave to print." But in this open statement made by Judge Kelley, chairman of the committee having the bill in charge, in presenting the bill, we find that it is declared to be merely a "*careful codification of existing laws.*"

Judge Kelley, near the close of his speech presenting the bill,—I have given you the page in the record,—referring again to the change in the superintendency of the mints, says:

"It is of the highest importance, therefore, that the

one single cardinal change that the bill proposes should be made."

There was and could be no suspicion thus far, that an English dagger lurked in the folds of this bill.

While Mr. Kelley was on his feet, Mr. Potter asked this question (volume 1, page 323):

"I desire to ask the gentleman who has this bill in charge, whether, if it become a law, it will make any change in the value of the coin issued pursuant to its provision to the value of the coin which now exists."

Mr. Kelley replied: "It does not."

The bill came up again, with nothing done to it in the meantime, on April 9, 1872.

A determination on the part of Mr. Hooper of Massachusetts, to press what was regarded as a bill dealing with a dry subject, caused most of the members to lose interest in the bill, but excited the suspicion of one member.

Mr. Potter said (volume 3, page 2310):

"I confess, therefore, that the introduction of the bill at such a period excited my suspicion. I was, and am, at a loss to gather from anything I know or can learn that there is any necessity for the adoption of this measure now."

Mr. Brooks of New York made a speech (volume 3, page 2316), ridiculing the proposition of taking up the time of the House with a bill there was nothing in. He said the House at that time was a subject for the pencil of a Nast in the caricatures of the day. It is during this day in the printed record of speeches that we discover that the change of the unit from silver to gold had been inserted in the bill.

It is in one of the printed speeches of Mr. Hooper.

Give me a jury, and make an issue for that jury to try, and let this be the issue—"Were the words printed in the record for that day spoken openly in the house?"

—and I will secure a verdict from that jury that part of them either were delivered by request for leave to print, a common custom in Congress by which speeches are printed without being actually delivered, or that Mr. Hooper read from manuscript and omitted in the delivery certain passages that afterward were printed.

It is not denied, however, that we could have bimetallism with the unit on gold. It would not be a safe experiment to try, but if the mints were left open to the unlimited coinage (making an unlimited demand) of the other metal, we might have bimetallism. As we will see later in this discussion, unlimited coinage is the first as to importance of the several conditions making bimetallism.

While the record disclosed the intention to change the unit to gold, it nowhere revealed the intention to close the mints to silver.

Mr. Hooper on this same day (April 9), goaded to it by an inquisitive member, said (volume 3, page 2306), that the bill "re-enacted laws in regard to silver, except that it changed the size of the silver dollar from 412½ grains standard silver to 384 grains." Mark you, I have quoted his exact words. He stated as a reason that this would take the three-per-cent premium out of the silver in the present silver dollar as compared with gold. In other words, he conveyed the express understanding that silver was to be favored. Less silver was to be put in a dollar. He did not say that the silver from which these silver dollars were to be coined was to be purchased nor that the mints were to be closed, but he did say that the bill re-enacted existing laws, except to change the size of the silver dollar.

This is the clause providing for the 384-grain dollar with the right to unlimited free coinage, that was sur-

reptitiously erased from the bill in 1873 before it was enrolled. By the erasure of this provision or by its omission in enrolling the bill, the mints were to be closed to silver. This was now the plan of the conspiracy.

The bill had re-enacted the law of 1853 providing for the purchase of silver for fractional silver coins, but that law had left the mints open to the silver dollar; but, by striking out the silver-dollar clause, the mints would be closed to silver. This was the point on which the minds of the conspirators were focused.

If the change of the unit from silver to gold passed the gantlet they were safe; with a copy of the bill sprung at the last moment omitting this sentence and possibly a further part of a sentence in one other section that referred to it, or with a willing clerk to fraudulently make this omission on enrollment, and their object would be accomplished.

Mr. Horr: I am very much obliged to my friend for referring to this history of the debate and quoting Mr. Potter of New York. When I called for the book I did it because my memory was very distinct that my friend Harvey had done precisely what he thinks conduces to the history of any subject. He has followed that method through this entire book of "Coin's Financial School," that is, to pick out some sentence that by itself alone will look as though it was on his side of the case, quote that and then leave the people to think that is the opinion of that man on that subject. It is an old method of arguing, but I say frankly, Brother Harvey, it has come into disrepute for a good many years. They used to do that always in all theological debates. There was never a thing so ridiculous or so absurd,—or so vile, hardly,—that a man could not find some passage in

Scripture which he would put as a motto at the head of his book, as we found in this book, and you never could "get" a fellow of that kind because he always had a passage ready. I know there was a chap taken up for robbing immigrants when they landed in the city of New York, and he immediately said he did it according to Scripture, and then he quoted Scripture, as follows: "They were strangers and I took them in." (Laughter.) Now, Brother Potter did speak in that debate and he spoke the words that my friend has quoted, and the book shows that it was a running debate,—they were not printed speeches at all, no leave to print at all, because page after page one man is up and then another; when they get leave to print, the thing comes out solid and nobody ever pays any attention to it because there was no one paying attention to it—it is like "Coin's School," you know, wasn't anybody there. (Laughter.) Mr. Potter in the course of his remarks says just what he (Mr. Harvey) has read, but afterward he went on to state:

"In the next place this bill provides for the making of changes in the legal-tender coin of the country, and for substituting a legal-tender of only one metal instead as heretofore of two. I think myself this would be a wise provision, and that legal-tender coins, except subsidiary coins, should be of gold alone." (Applause.)

You didn't read that part of it for the same reason that you left off part of the statute we talked about yesterday, it was not necessary for the points you were making now, but if you had read that it would have shown that the point you were making was not correct at all. Now I submit to this audience there is right there in that speech that you refer to, positive proof that that bill was well understood by the people who were legislating upon it. Mr. Potter opposed the bill, but he

was frank enough to state that one provision in the bill met with his hearty approval, and that was the very provision we are debating here to-day. No better proof can possibly be given that that bill was, like all the bills passed in that Congress, examined carefully, conscientiously. Men differed about the necessity of such a law. It was not an entirely new question. Mind you, Mr. Potter only suggested that it was not necessary at that time because we were not using either silver or gold as money. At the same time he afterward supported the bill and aided in changing the silver coin to the trade dollar. There had never been but eight million silver dollars coined, not quite eight million up to the passage of that bill—

Voice in the audience: Coin or silver?

Mr. Horr: I said silver dollars coined. There had been a large amount of fractional coin, but we lost all of it by 1853, and we made it subsidiary, and the coinage after that remained in the country.

Now England, it is true, had demonetized silver in 1816. They had done it because the men who understood that subject best in England had concluded it was best; they were the clearing house of the world; they were seeking to get control of doing the business of the world, and they had been ages trying to find out what was the trouble when you coin two metals at a certain ratio. They found that when a ratio varied, when it was different from the commercial ratio, one metal or the other disappeared from use among the people, and scientifically they decided it was best to have only one money standard and they had adopted this away back in 1816.

Now, my friend in his book is mistaken when he tells us that Germany followed the United States. Why, Ger-

many demonetized silver in 1871, not in 1873. The edict was in 1871 and Germany coined no silver (free coinage) after 1871. In 1873 another act was passed by the legislature, but free coinage had ceased before that. That is the record of that government. It is true the subject had been agitated in this country ever since 1870. We neither followed Germany nor did she follow us. After the French war Germany threw upon the markets, as I now remember it, three hundred million dollars of silver; it was in consideration of the fact that that was about to be done that the people of the world set to thinking and acting upon this silver question. There was no conspiracy about it. I want to say to this audience and to the American people that laws of that kind are never planned by conspirators; there is no such thing as a great "money power" either in this or any other country that dominates the people of that country. (Applause.) The people of the United States act independently. It is a slander upon civilization, the proposition that Mr. Harvey makes and tries to maintain here to-day. (Applause.)

QUESTIONS BY THE AUDIENCE.

This ended the debate for the day, and Judge Miller announced that questions from the audience would be received.

Mr. Horr: This is a question by Charles Coffin of Arkansas:

"If the American people always act independently on great questions, why do you oppose their doing so on the free coinage of silver?" (Applause.)

Why do you cheer till you know what I say? Why don't you wait? Maybe you won't want to cheer. My answer to that is, I did not know that I had opposed anywhere on the face of the earth their acting on the

subject, and I did not know as anybody in the United States had ever opposed it. It is a new thing to me.

The next question is from Hon. J.C. Sibley of Pennsylvania:

"In view of your statement that the silver dollar was worth more by at least three per cent than the gold dollar in 1873, what justification do you make of the claim of the monometallist that silver was demonetized because of its decline in value arising from over-production of silver?"

My answer to this is, that the monometallists do not claim anything of the kind. (Laughter.) Wait till I get through. When questions are asked me you must let me answer them. The monometallists claim that silver was demonetized because the men in Congress in 1873 believed that silver was not as good a measure for values, that it was more unstable than gold; and they demonetized it on that account, because they thought there was going to be an influx brought in from Germany. They claim that afterward the over-production of silver was such as to drive the price down—down, and they have refused to enact any laws re-instating the free coinage of silver on the old ratio because over-production has continually reduced the price. That was not given as the reason for passing the law. Germany did not give it; England did not give it; France did not give it; but they gave the reason that silver is not the best measure of value for the people of the civilized world. They give the reason that it is continually cheapening in price because of the constant increase in production. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. Sibley: As long as you ask me, I will ask you. You will allow, then, if the claim is made by monometallists that silver was demonetized because of the large

increase of production that that statement would be incorrect?

MR. HORR: That statement would be nonsensical, because it was not cheap at that time. Certainly you and I don't differ about it; that is a business proposition. A man with your sense—and I have got about as much—wouldn't get into any such foolish nonsense as that.

The next question is by Howard S. Taylor of Chicago, one of the referees in this case—I want to give him dignity.

"Is it true that in volume 2, page 165, public document on Finance, Mr. Jefferson communicated to Congress a report of the director of the mint in which the reason assigned for discontinuing the coinage of the dollar was the need of small change among bankers and the fear that the specie would be exported? I present the book open at the page."

It is true. January 15, 1806, Mr. Jefferson sent to Congress—and I take it it was very near the time that this letter was dated when he made the order—he sent a communication from Robert Patterson, the director of the mint, which had been sent to him, and he communicated it or sent it in his communication to Congress. And one of the statements in that communication of Mr. Patterson reads as follows:

"The striking of small coins is a measure which has been adopted to accommodate the bankers and other depositors and at their particular request, but with a view of furnishing a supply of small change and to prevent the exportation of the specie of the United States to foreign countries."

The clause previous to that reads:

"Of the precious metals the number of pieces coined in the last year far exceeds that of any former year since the establishment of the mint. Indeed it is con-

siderably more than double what it has been in any one of the four last years."

I say yes, that is in the record and occurred. No doubt about it.

Mr. Harvey: This question is by H. L. Bliss of the Sound Money League, of Chicago:

"You state that there was coined prior to 1873, $143,-000,000 of silver, and that there was besides $100,000,-000 of foreign coin in circulation. There had been coined also $850,000,000 of gold. Was this also in circulation?"

The answer is, they were both in circulation up to the suspension of specie payments in 1861. Up to 1850 there were two dollars in silver in circulation in this country to one dollar in gold. Then came the enormous gold discoveries in California and the large increase in gold circulation that makes Mr. Bliss's figures show up so well for gold: they came after those discoveries, between 1850 and 1873. How much of this gold had gone abroad I do not undertake to say.

The next question is by Mr. L. G. Powers of Michigan:

"You said yesterday, 'My answer is, first, that I did not say that I had forced them to change it or to correct any mistake.' In 'Coin's Financial School up to Date,' page 152, you say:

"'Coin here explains how an error had crept into the official report of the Treasurer. * * * that he had since forced the Treasury Department to correct that error!' Please explain the manifest discrepancy."

The answer is, Coin, a little boy in knee breeches, represents the cause of bimetallism; he does not represent me. (Applause and groans on each side of the house respectively.) I would not have the egotism to claim

that I represent Coin in the many arguments and sentiments and kind things said about the little boy by the author, and when Coin's influence is exercised at Washington or San Francisco or Memphis, it means the influence of bimetallism and humanity.

On the request of Mr. Horr the further hearing of the debate was adjourned to 1 o'clock, Saturday, July 19.

CHAPTER V.

THE FOURTH DAY. THE LEGISLATION OF 1873 CONCLUDED —THE RATIO OF GOLD AND SILVER IN HISTORY.

SATURDAY afternoon brought a crowd that packed the debating hall. The interest was intense, almost every point made by the speakers being received with applause or murmurs. The debate opened shortly after 1 P. M. —Judge Miller in the chair.

MR. HARVEY: The debate so far is of value in this:

1. It shows that gold and silver is the money of the constitution.

2. That the silver dollar of 371¼ grains of pure silver was the unit of value in our monetary system and regulated the other coins in our coinage system from 1792 to 1873.

3. That silver and gold in concurrent coinage was until 1873 the standard and measure of value of all other property and the basic principle of our monetary system.

4. That prior to 1873, when one metal increased in exchange value over the other, the debtor had the right to pay in the cheaper metal. (See question on second day by Mr. Motsinger of Indiana, and answer of Mr. Horr.)

5. That silver was not demonetized by the act of 1873 on account of the over-production of silver. (See question by Mr. Sibley of Pennsylvania, and answer by Mr. Horr, in the third day of the debate.)

6. That $143,000,000 of silver were coined by our mint prior to 1873.

This debate is of great value in removing these points of doubt, that are now more or less subject of general discussion, and brings us nearer to the issue in the controversy.

I wish in the way of summary to say that I have made no charge in this debate reflecting upon the general integrity of the American people, and I do not intend that those corrupt in official life shall throw around themselves the cloak of integrity of the American people for their protection. (Applause.) Nor did I say, as it was attempted to be construed, that every man has his price. I said that that saying had its origin in the corrupt English Parliament at a time when history tells us that bribery was common, and nearly all, or a large portion, of the members of that Parliament were subject to the accusation of bribery. Were it true that the integrity of the American people as a whole could be impeached, a remedy for what we are now discussing would be fruitless in the attempt. It is on that integrity that we rely, and to that integrity that we appeal. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr, in his closing speech at the last session, refers to what Mr. Potter says as to the support of the bill before the House, and accuses me of unfairness in not reading the whole of Mr. Potter's speech. I called your attention to Mr. Potter's speech to show you that the introduction of this mint bill, at the time it was before the House, excited his suspicion, showing that it was inappropriate to be considered at that period. Mr. Potter was suspicious. It was a Congress in which it was natural to be suspicious. Mr. Potter was satisfied that something was wrong back of the bill, and by following his speech through you see that Potter thought it was a speculation in nickel, that the bill provided

for the recoining of the cent pieces the way Hooper had it then before the House, by making these cent pieces largely of nickel, and Potter, from the experience of that Congress and the numerous investigating committees there were then in session, supposed that that was where there was something wrong or corrupt. Mr. Potter was not a bimetallist in the sense of understanding bimetallism, or he would have seen what was behind the bill, and later in this discussion I ask Mr. Horr to explain the inconsistency between Mr. Hooper's assertions as to the bill being fair and Mr. Potter's suggestion that it made a change in the coinage system. That was on April 9. Mr. Potter and Mr. Brooks, both suspicious of the bill, defeated its being taken up on that day, and the bill went over, and on May 27 it again came before the House, not in the form of the bill which Mr. Hooper had been pressing, but in the form of a new bill. This time Mr. Hooper presented it in the form of a substitute. Mr. Hooper called up the bill offered as a substitute and closed with this proposition:

"I move that the rules be suspended and that the substitute be put on its passage."

Whether the change of the unit from silver to gold was in the bill up to that moment is not certain. We have only Mr. Hooper's manuscript speech. It was, however, in the substitute. At any rate, this remarkable debate followed. (Vol. III., page 38, May 27, 1872.)

DEBATE ON THE COINAGE BILL.

"Mr. Brooks: I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Hooper) to postpone his motion until his colleague on the committee, my colleague from New York (Mr. Potter), is in his seat. It is my impression that he does not concur in the substitute."

This is the suspicious Potter.

"Mr. Hooper, of Massachusetts: It is so late in the session that I must decline waiting any longer.

"Mr. Brooks: I would again suggest to the gentleman that he should wait until my colleague comes in.

"Mr. Hooper: I cannot do so.

"Mr. Holman: I suppose it is intended to have the bill read before it is put upon its passage.

"The Speaker: The substitute will be read.

"Mr. Hooper: I hope not. It is a long bill, and those who are interested in it are perfectly familiar with its provisions.

"Mr. Kerr: The rules cannot be suspended so as to dispense with the reading of the bill.

"The Speaker: They can be.

"Mr. Kerr: I want the House to understand that it is attempted to put through this bill without being read.

"The Speaker: Does the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Hooper, move that the reading of the bill be dispensed with?

"Mr. Hooper: I will so frame my motion that it will dispense with the reading of the bill."

Here was an attempt to pass a bill—a bill to regulate the life-blood of the Nation—without being read. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: Before commencing the regular work of the day I desire to call the attention of my opponent and of the people who may read this discussion to a statement made by Mr. Harvey on day before yesterday. It is in substance this: That whenever he should make any statement which I should fail to deny he should take it for granted from my silence that I admitted the truth of what he said. Mr. Harvey, you have no power to force me into such a position.

Mr. Harvey: I don't think I said that. I said that any proposition in the book that you did not dispute I would take for granted was correct.

Mr. Horr: That wasn't what I understood you to say. But even then, I will admit nothing of the kind. It might do in an ordinary running debate where both men are standing up and discussing a question in an offhand manner, but such has not been the course followed by my opponent. Since the opening of this discussion he has done little but read essays prepared and written out, filled up with a lot of incorrect, and, as I think, untrue verbiage. It is impossible for me to remember and call attention to all his carefully written and misleading statements. I will give him a rule that he can follow with my permission. It is this: You may take it for granted that I admit nothing which you state or have stated except when I say so; that I deny the bulk of the stuff that you have heretofore printed or that you have prepared and are now reading from day to day. I supposed that I was at liberty to take the utterances of "Coin" in his financial teachings as the utterances of my opponent. But on Thursday when "Coin," by the question of one of the people here in attendance, was caught in having told a "whopper," Mr. Harvey refused to be responsible for "Coin," and "Coin's" statements, although the youngster had given utterance only to words put into his mouth by Mr. Harvey himself. Now, I submit that such treatment of this wonderful little baby is cruel, and smacks of the step-father. This is especially the case, because the father in this instance was really begotten by the boy. (Laughter.) The laws of nature in this case seem to have been reversed. Were it not for the sayings of this young prodigy we would have no Harvey. Now, I beg of my opponent not hereafter to go back on "little Coin," because if he does, who is responsible for him? Then, you see, the difficulty will be to fix your own status in a case like that.

THE LAW OF 1873.

I now proceed with the discussion of the law of 1873. My opponent, after spending the whole, or nearly so, of the last session in trying to smirch the people of the United States—not only the American Congress, but the people of the city where he now lives—begins to take water and wants it understood that he does not intend to make out that everybody is wicked. I have shown you that this bill had its incipiency among the experts on coinage in the United States. I should have stated that previous to 1873 there had been a monetary conference held in Paris—I think he has referred to that conference—and said that Senator Sherman was present at the conference. I quote here from W. A. Shaw's "History of Currency," page 275:

"The first widely embracing international conference proper, however, was the outcome of an expression of opinion in the conclave of the Latin Union. It was called at the invitation of France and met at Paris on the 17th of June, 1867. The states represented were—"

Now listen—

"Austria, Baden, Bavaria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, the United States, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, Turkey and Wurtemberg. The eight sessions of the conference occupied till the 6th of July, 1867. All the states except Holland declared in favor of the gold standard."

Now that is the record of that conference, showing that the subject was being agitated by the civilized nations of the world. They had met together; they had discussed this question eight long days or sessions; and then, with the exception of Holland, every one of them had declared in favor of the gold standard. It was after that action that our experts commenced to ex-

amine the question and see what legislation should be enacted. I stated that they honestly engaged in that work. Has he proven a syllable to the contrary of that? Now mark; those experts were American citizens that held financial positions. The bill of 1873 simply carried out a resolution of all these civilized nations of the world. I showed this: I showed you how openly, how completely that bill was drawn in all fairness and submitted in every detail to the American people. Now, Mr. Harvey comes back by saying it was passed by corruption, and he seeks to prove it because certain officials some time about that era were caught stealing. I am familiar with the tactics of this whole business. The silver men have attempted from the start to smirch that bill by claiming that those men were all false to their duties. The first yarn that they told, and published in a thousand papers broadcast all over the United States, was that a man by the name of Ernest Seyd visited the United States and brought with him $500,000 in gold and that he paid that gold to secure the passage of that bill. Brother Harvey, your people asserted that year in and year out. You published it in your newspapers, you used it on the hustings. I heard it dozens of times asserted even on the floor of Congress. There wasn't one word of truth in it, not a syllable. Only a little while ago somebody happened to think that maybe Ernest Seyd had written something on the question. Mr. Hooper, who was as honorable a man as ever served in the American Congress, had died, was in his grave. This stuff was being retailed about him all over the United States, and especially this Ernest Seyd yarn was told in every part of this country. Only a few months ago it occurred to some one to write to Mr. Hooper's widow and children and see if there

wasn't something that could be found on that subject. Mr. Harvey knows the result. They there found a letter from Ernest Seyd in reply to Mr. Hooper, who had sent him this identical bill and asked his opinion upon it. In the course of Mr. Seyd's letter he said (the letter covered many pages):

"I now come to the most important part of the bill, which omits the coinage of the silver dollar and affirms the debased silver coinage of half-dollars and below under the tender limit of five dollars. I am aware, of course, that through the amendment of 1853 the same debased coinage was already established, but, although the absolute coinage of the silver dollar had actually ceased, still, that was not abolished by law."

Now listen. Here is the man that they said came over to buy up the American Congress in favor of demonetizing silver.

"As this is a new bill and presumably repeals all previous enactments, I suppose that the total abolishment of the silver dollar is contemplated. I think that the United States with her gold and silver mines is in an eminently favorable position to uphold the full use of both gold and silver and that the double valuation as it existed before would be of great benefit to the country." (Applause.)

My free-silver friends clap their hands. This is the man that you vilified all over the United States.

"I am, myself, as you will perceive from my writings, and others with me, in favor of the full and complete adoption of the double standard."

And in that letter from Mr. Seyd from beginning to end, covering pages and pages of typewritten matter, he does nothing but oppose the very measure that these men say he spent so much money to pass through the American Congress.

Mr. Harvey: I am going to hold this argument on the track if I can. (Applause.) The report of the

Monetary Conference at Paris in 1867 will contradict the history that Mr. Horr has read from. I leave him with that. As to Ernest Seyd and a letter found among Mr. Hooper's effects since he and Seyd both died, it reminds me of this—suppose in the years to come that some one were to say to the people then living that John G. Carlisle was a bimetallist, and say, "Here is the proof of it," and were to read from Mr. Carlisle's speech:

"The demonetization of silver is the greatest crime of the ages, and its consequences for evil are greater than all the floods and fires and pestilences of the past."

Would that prove that Mr. Carlisle was a bimetallist at a particular time when something might be charged against him when he acted as Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Cleveland? If that Seyd letter, disentombed by the zealous friends and family of Mr. Hooper, was to prove anything it would prove that Mr. Hooper falsified when he said that he had submitted that bill to distinguished experts and they had all agreed that it was the proper thing to do.

I continue with the presentation of the substitute by Mr. Hooper, that he was so solicitous should not be read.

Next in the record is this:

"THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the rules be suspended and that the bill pass, the reading thereof being dispensed with.

"MR. RANDALL: Cannot we have a division of that motion?

"THE SPEAKER: A motion to suspend the rules cannot be divided.

"MR. RANDALL: I should like to have the bill read, although I am willing that the rules shall be suspended as to the passage of the bill.

"The question was put on suspending the rules and

passing the bill without reading; and (two-thirds not voting in favor thereof) the rules were not suspended."

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS.

The record shows that the clerk began to read the bill, when he was interrupted, and the reading stopped with the interruption. Members then satisfied themselves with asking him questions, and the reading of the bill was never continued. Mr. Holman asked this question:

"Before the question is taken upon suspending the rules and passing the bill I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will explain the leading changes made by this bill in the existing law, especially in reference to the coinage. It would seem as if the small coinage of the country is intended to be recoined."

To this Mr. Hooper replied:

"The bill makes no change in the existing laws in that regard."

This question was then asked:

"Is not the salary of the Sub-Treasurer at New York increased?"

Mr. Garfield asked this question:

"Does the gentleman say that no salary is increased by this bill?"

Then came this question from another member:

"Are there any additional offices created?"

Then this question:

"How many mints are provided for by the bill?"

This is a sample of the fusillade of questions put by members, the questions themselves indicating the character of the importance they attached to the bill, and showing their ignorance of the critical provision. They were more concerned over whether a salary was raised by the bill than anything else—or some minor point,

showing that none of them comprehended that a fundamental question might be involved in the bill. And how could they? The bill (the substitute) had been offered within the hour, and was passed within the hour without having been read.

This question was put and answered:

"MR. BROOKS: My colleague from the Westminster District [Mr. Potter—this was the suspicious Potter who was now absent] stated the other day that this bill provided for the recoinage of more or less of the small currency of the country and the creation of a new currency.

"MR. HOOPER: That is not the case with the bill as it now stands."

The rules were then suspended and the substitute passed about an hour after it was offered, and passed without being read. The second session of the 42d Congress adjourned soon after, and the same Congress met again in December.

IN THE SENATE.

The bill was called up in the Senate by Senator Sherman on January 17, 1873; he began by saying (Congressional Globe, Part 1, third session 42d Congress, page 668):

"I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the mint bill, as it is commonly called, revising and amending the laws relative to the mints and assay offices and coinage of the United States. I do not think it will take more than the time consumed in the reading of it."

On being interrupted by an attempt to bring up another bill he said: "I think it will only take the time required in reading it."

He was, however, again interrupted, and again he commenced by saying, "I will state that this bill will

not probably consume any more time than the time consumed in reading it."

Again, when answering Senator Casserly of California, on the subject of abrasion of coins, he said: "I believe this is the only controverted point in the bill."

Again, after an attempt by his bill to take the eagle off silver coins was voted down, he said:

"As the Senate are so patriotic that they will not abolish the eagle, I hope they will be perfectly willing now to hurry along with the bill."

Again, he said:

"I do not wish to enter into a discussion in regard to this coinage charge that may probably weary the Senate and delay the passage of the bill. I promised that the bill will not take more than an hour, and when I made that promise I supposed these amendments which had been acted upon would be acted upon *sub silentio*, and other questions which had been settled would not be revived."

It is evident that it was the intention of Senator Sherman to convince the Senate that no careful consideration of the bill was necessary, and in this he succeeded, as appears from something Senator Casserly said during a discussion provoked by him about abrasion. It is this:

"I will not contest it with him (Sherman) because it is evident very few senators are paying attention to this subject."

In answer to a question from Senator Casserly Sherman said (Congressional Globe, part 1, third session 42d Congress, page 672):

"If the Senator will allow me, he will see that the preceding section provides for coin which is exactly interchangeable with the English shilling and the five-franc piece of France; that is the five-franc piece of France will be the exact equivalent of a dollar of the United States in our silver coinage."

Mr. Horr: That is right, Mr. Harvey. The bill that was reported to the Senate and that they were then discussing had in it a provision for the coining of silver dollars, the silver dollars about which you talked at the last session of this debate, containing 384 grains, and they were made, with all the other silver coins, subsidiary coins. There was no provision in the bill at that time, and I do not believe you dare claim there was, for the free coinage of a dollar of 384 grains. Nobody ever had the effrontery to claim that the American Congress would have stultified itself in that way. That provision had been introduced into it in the House, and it was a part of it, a provision for coining a dollar precisely like the five-franc piece in use in France—no doubt about it. The Senate struck that provision out and substituted the trade dollar for that 384-grain dollar.

Now, have you ever noticed that the opposition to that bill in the House came from Clarkson N. Potter, from Mr. Brooks—

Mr. Harvey: May I interrupt you?

Mr. Horr: Certainly.

A POINTED PROPOSITION.

Mr. Harvey: If you will show me from the record of the proceedings in the Senate on that day that the Senate struck out that dollar we will stop this debate right here. (Long and enthusiastic applause.)

Mr. Horr: I have not the record, but I can get it. The law when it was passed had the trade dollar in it. Do you deny that?

Mr. Harvey: No, sir, I do not.

Mr. Horr: And didn't that take the place of the other dollar?

MR. HARVEY: No, sir. (Laughter.)

MR. HORR: I defy you to show a word anywhere that substantiates that position. It was a simple piece of legislation, and bears that impression on its face. That bill, after it left the House, was amended and the trade dollar was put in there at the instance of men who thought that it could be coined and used in our trade with China. It was put in at the instance of the silver producers of the country.

But you stopped me just as I was calling your attention to a fact. The only men who opposed that bill in the House were Clarkson N. Potter and Mr. Brooks, both millionaires from Wall Street, both representing the very men that you say were trying to impose that bill upon this country for the purpose of aiding men who are rich. Was anything ever more contemptible than a proposition of that kind? You would have Clarkson N. Potter trembling for fear the bill would help the millionaires? Wanted to investigate it more carefully—what about? Mr. Potter stated in so many words the truth; he thought it was inopportune, but he says:

"I am in favor of the gold unit. I am in favor of that provision of the bill."

That is the very provision that you are making such a fuss about.

But I must proceed. That bill became a law by the substitution of the trade dollar. The law in reference to making the gold dollar the unit of value was never changed at any stage in the progress of the bill. Mr. Harvey has not even had ingenuity enough to put such a provision in brackets, and I will now say for the benefit of the country that there is not one word of truth in that whole bracket business. No such thing ever

occurred in the United States, and there is no proof of it either; it is innuendo and nothing else.

It is apparent, however, that the bill met with little opposition, not because its provisions were not understood, but because at that time no one cared very much about the silver dollar.

Silver was at that time being bought by the government and coined, if at all, into subsidiary coins. The subsidiary coins were of less value than their face, and the government made a profit on them. The new bill provided for the same thing. Our silver dollars were worth more at that time uncoined than coined. Of course the owners of silver could not have afforded to have them coined. Neither could the government afford to buy bullion and coin standard silver dollars—"the dollars of the daddies" that they tell us so much about. Consequently they dropped them from the coinage at that time, and it had little practical interest to any one except the experts who were trying to get a good system of coinage for the United States.

Now, since all this talk, many people have had their attention called to the passage of this law. I have before me an extract from a letter published recently in *The New York Independent* and signed by Justin S. Morrill of Vermont. I take pride in reading it, because Mr. Morrill and myself were born near the same spot in the little State of Vermont, and I know that he comes from good stock and from a good territory. (Laughter.) If there is an honest, pure man inside the United States it is Justin S. Morrill, and the men that have served with him of all parties for the last thirty years in this country, without an exception, will unite in saying just that much about him. I never yet heard the slandering tongue of even a free silverite talk against

Senator Morrill. Here is what he said only a few days ago:

"There has been a loud and delusive cry about the act of Congress in 1873, which, after three years of consideration by the Treasury Department and by Congress, purposely omitted to provide for the further coinage of the silver dollar, none having been coined for nearly forty years and only eight millions had ever been coined. All that time the only currency in use as money was depreciated paper, a legal-tender for all debts, and debts then on a specie basis could have been paid in gold at about two per cent less cost than in silver. It was sought to avoid its instability, which followed sooner, perhaps, than was expected, and this prudent and politic act has been the ark which has saved our people from being wholly overwhelmed by the silver flood."

That is said by a man who served through the entire time that this bill was being discussed and who knows what he is talking about. (Enthusiastic applause.)

Mr. Harvey: The other day when Mr. Horr said that the bill before the Senate as shown by the Congressional Record only had a trade dollar in it, I replied that when I got to the Senate proceedings, he would have to retreat from that position (applause), and now he retreats of his own accord. (Applause and laughter.)

Mr. Sherman, in speaking of the silver dollar on that day, said, "We are providing that it shall float all over the world." Again he said (42d Congress, Volume I. page 672):

"This bill proposes a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe" (meaning the Latin Union), "who have adopted the international standard of silver coinage; that is, the dollar provided for by this bill is the precise equivalent of the five-franc piece. It contains the same number of grams of silver; and we have

adopted the international gram instead of the grain for the standard of our silver coinage. The 'trade dollar' has been adopted mainly for the people of California and others engaged in trade with China. That is the only coin measured by the grain instead of by the gram. The intrinsic value of each is to be stamped upon the coin."

The idea conveyed was this: Our silver dollar was above par with gold, because of the French ratio of 15½ to 1 while ours was 16 to 1. The Latin Union alone had maintained the commercial and coinage value of silver and gold undisturbed at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and by reducing our silver dollar to 384 grains, the same size as the French five-franc piece, with our mint open to it, as was that of France, a parity of the two metals was assured and our "silver dollar would float around the world." (Applause.) It was in this form that the bill passed the Senate, as it had passed the House. There was no disagreement. The only thing that had happened that they had not anticipated was that the debate in the Senate had forced them to show their hand and to disclose the fact that the dollar was in the bill—the dollar that Mr. Horr said the other day was not in the bill—

Mr. Horr: I didn't. I will not be misquoted on that, and I never said anything of the kind. I appeal to the record. I have never denied that that small dollar was in the bill when it went from the House over to the Senate, never, nowhere, and if I had I would take it back in half a minute, for when I am shown that I am in the wrong I always own it,—I don't try to dodge it as Coin does.

Mr. Harvey: I refer this dispute to the only just judge,—the record of the day's debate in which Mr. Horr said it. (Applause.)

The bill had now passed both houses with a slight disagreement of two or three minor points only, but it made a necessity for it to go to a conference committee. Here is where the dirty work was done and the conspiracy culminated.

It was the duty of the conference committee to settle the disputed points only, and the Congressional Record shows the silver-dollar clause was not one of the contested points. If it were an honest committee it would not have tried to change what both houses had already agreed on; it would simply try to perform its duty in disposing of the disputed points. A conference committee was appointed, composed of Senators Sherman, Scott of Pennsylvania, and Bayard of Delaware, on the part of the Senate, and Hooper of Massachusetts, Stoughton of Michigan and McNealy of Illinois on the part of the House.

The committee either acted upon the disputed points formally or left the matter to Senator Sherman and Mr. Hooper, the two who were taking the most active interest in the bill, as is frequently done in committees. At any rate, those two, Sherman and Hooper, are next found in their respective houses with the bill in their hands, representing that the committee had agreed upon the points of difference, presented the report, and recommended that the bill pass.

The Congressional Record thereupon says, "The Report was concurred in." These five words and no more. No questions were asked; no debate took place. The two houses, knowing that the points of difference were immaterial, would naturally pay no attention to it, the committee was supposed to have performed their simple duty and not on any points to have reversed the action of the two houses. But they had. They had

taken out the 384 grain dollar, the size of the French five-franc piece, the dollar that was to "float around the world," the dollar that would have put our system on the same basic ratio with France and the Latin Union.

If that dollar was only a subsidiary dollar, limited to the purchase of silver by the Secretary of the Treasury only, and that was its only virtue in that bill, why did it disappear from the bill? (Applause.)

Years afterward, when it was discovered what that corrupt Congress did, a search through the records, printed bills and committee's reports taken from the pigeon-holes disclosed that changes had been made in all things that would bolster up this work, except in the Congressional Record which transcribes immediately what occurs on the floor and is printed on the same day. This was printed already and had gone into the bound volumes. But the report of the Senate Finance Committee turned up so altered as to show that that committee reported an amendment to strike out the silver dollar. It is apparent why this was done. It was to furnish the excuse or the authority for the conference committee's fraudulent action.

I will show you conclusively in a few minutes that the section in which this occurs was agreed upon without any amendment at the time being considered to it. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: I wish to say now that I have never intimated there was not at one time in that bill a provision for the small dollar of 384 grains. I do deny that in any draft of the bill it was ever made anything but a subsidiary coin, and I defy you to prove that the clause making the gold dollar the unit of value was ever erased from the bill in any of its proceedings anywhere during the entire discussion. (Applause.)

Now the bill went, as he says, to the committee of conference. Three-fourths of the complicated laws which are enacted in the United States pass in that way. The Senate differs from the House in a bill, the House differs from the Senate. There are provisions in the bill that both houses have not agreed to; the bill is sent to a conference committee always, as a rule three men from each body. Mr. Sherman, Mr. Scott and Mr. Bayard from the Senate,—Mr. Harvey, were they corrupt men? Were not their reputations as good as the average advocates of silver in the United States? The committee in the House were all of them honorable men, they did precisely what every committee on conference does. They took up the bill and tried to adjust the differences. Mr. Harvey, if he had had any experience, would not have told you here that that committee never changes anything on which the two houses have agreed,—he should know better than that. Sometimes if you strike out one part of a law the committee from the other house will claim that that changes the whole thing, so that it is necessary to make other alterations. Then the committee discuss it carefully and they finally agree, usually not touching things both houses have agreed upon, except the members from one or the other of the branches of Congress insist it is necessary. Now that does not pass the bill. The committee of conference does not make the law. They return the bill to the House, to the Senate, and they are compelled to state to each body, the chairman of the committee of conference is compelled to state, just what changes have been made. They report always, "Your committee have agreed to report," and then they state the agreements and the differences.

Sometimes, not often, a motion will be made to con-

cur in the whole report, but generally some one proposes to non-concur in something, and then the House or the Senate votes on the proposition, and if the House is not satisfied with the bill as the committee have agreed upon it they send it back to another committee or the same one for further action. The Senate does the same. The bill is not a law till both houses have concurred in the amendments made by the committee on conference.

No unusual thing was done with this bill. It passed almost precisely as the Secretary of the Treasury had recommended it when he first sent the draft to the American Congress. The only other feature of any importance in it was the new feature of the trade dollar, otherwise it was nearly identical with the bill that had first been drafted. And for a man now to stand up and say that the men in that Congress who passed that bill were generally corrupt, I repeat again, it is infamous for an American citizen to endeavor in that way to smirch the character of the best citizens of the United States. (Applause.)

If that bill was a fraud then the majority of the members of Congress in 1873 were fraudulent men. It is not true. Now I happen to have right here a letter just written by a member of that Congress, Jasper Packard, of New Albany, Ind. Some of you may have known him. I have been acquainted with him long years, and I want to say to Mr. Harvey that with all the possible admiration that I have already been able to get up for your character, I think fully as much of Packard as I do of you. (Laughter and applause.) He is an old friend of my friend Doctor Robinson, who sits here. The Doctor wrote him, knowing he was in that Congress, and asked him about it. Listen to his reply:

"NEW ALBANY, INDIANA, May 20, 1895.

"MY DEAR DOCTOR:—The regular routine grind of a daily paper (he is an editor) has prevented me from writing as I intended. Day to day has gone by and here I am. It was my intention to write you at some length concerning the celebrated silver legislation, "the great crime" of 1873, as to what I know about it. But, really, it is scarcely worth while. The "sound money" papers have quoted largely from the most important debate that was had upon the bill, on the 9th day of April, 1872. I heard it all, Hooper 's speech and Kelley's and all the rest. The only opposition to the bill came from the "money power;" that is, as represented there by Clarkson N. Potter, James Brooks and Fernando Wood. At the time the dollar was not wholly dropped. The gold dollar was made the unit of value in the bill from its first printing, and a dollar of 384 grains was provided for and put in the list of the subsidiary coins, legal-tender to only five dollars. Afterward that dollar was dropped entirely, and the trade dollar, with more silver in it, was substituted There was never any secrecy about it. I was not on the Committee of Coinage, Weights and Measures, but I know all about it in every step of it. The man who, being then a senator or representative, and pleads ignorance of the dropping of the old dollar, stultifies himself. And the same may be said of the newspapers that had Washington correspondents. That is all I need say. All the rest is in the Congressional Record and has been often quoted.

"Sincerely your friend, JASPER PACKARD.

"To Dr. S. A. Robinson." (Applause.)

MR. HARVEY: The man who wrote that letter ought to have read the Congressional Record. (Applause.) When he says in that letter that the trade dollar was substituted for the dollar that was omitted, he is contradicted by the record of that day, from which I am now reading and which is on this table before Mr. Horr, and, I think I am right, he is contradicted by

Mr. Horr's last speech. There was no substituting of the trade dollar for the dollar for which I am contending. They are both in the bill (applause), and Senator Sherman, as I have just read to you from one of his short speeches on that day, explains that the dollar is in there of 384 grains, the same as the French five-franc piece, and puts our coinage on the same basis as the French coinage and gives us a dollar that will float around the world. (Applause.) And then he adds in the next line: "The trade dollar provided for in this bill is for use with China and California," no substituting. I am now looking for that dollar that was to float around the world. (Applause.) And I want to know what became of it. Senator Sherman told all those senators that it was there when he was forced to do it by Senator Casserly. I want you to show me where in any recorded proceeding of the debate in the Senate or House that dollar was struck out, and if you will show it here, this debate will stop. (Applause.)

When the men that were manipulating that bill, when reaching the critical period in the action of that conspiracy, had played their part in secrecy they were confronted with this situation: The Congressional Record had been made up. It showed that when section 15 of the House bill, afterward called 14 in the bill as passed, was disposed of, that section (16) 15 was the next in order, where the silver dollar appeared, and that no amendment to it had been considered, proving that none existed. That on disposing of the previous section, the one on abrasion, the President of the Senate said, "The next amendment is to strike out section (17) 16," thus skipping the section in which the dollar appeared and showing that it was not considered by the Senate at all, except as their attention had been called

to it by Senator Sherman when Senator Casserly wanted to know where it was. (Applause.) The section (17) 16 was next considered, the section following the one in which the silver dollar was provided for In other words, by the record, in the presiding officer's words, there was no amendment to section (16) 15, the silver-dollar section to be considered, and it was passed as it came from the House simply by being marked "agreed to."

The debate itself showed that it was in the bill with no objection to it, and praised greatly that it was there. This was the embarrassment. But in the hurry and desire to cover their tracks, the House bill, with the Senate Finance Committee's proposed amendments, turned up reprinted, is put in the pigeonhole where such bills belong, contradicting both the Senate proceedings and Senator Sherman's own words, but furnishing an excuse for the fraudulent conference report.

Now, as to what Mr. Horr says about the change made by the conference committee. I am right and every congressman will confirm it, and the common sense of the people will be with me on it, that a conference committee between two legislative bodies is to agree, if possible, on what has been disagreed to. And if in agreeing on those things that have been disagreed to, it requires a change in the verbiage of the bill elsewhere to make it read consistently, they make that change. But they never go to a section that has been agreed upon and make a change, that is a fundamental change that has not been disagreed upon. (Continued applause.) And that is what the men who handled the conference report, or some fraudulent clerk, did after this bill had passed both the House and Senate with the American dollar in it. (Applause.) By the same

corrupt practice an omission was evidently made in section 21. I ask the voters of the republic to read the Congressional Record of January 17, 1873, and see for themselves that it is there expressed that the silver dollar was in the bill before it was emasculated by the conference committee, the silver dollar that was with the trade dollar to have free access to the mints. Thus the conspiracy succeeded either by a corrupt clerk or the two men who made the report, or both. If the latter then these two conspirators had admirably performed their work. If the former, then there stood a man in the Senate with sallow face and conscience dead with this report of the conference committee in his hand who was to go undetected facing a Vice-President who was soon to be detected in a smaller crime. At the other end of the capitol a similar drama was being enacted. Mr. Hooper was presenting a similar report surrounded by members of a House, a majority of whose hands had been in more than one corrupt deal that session, and who closed the corrupt record of a corrupt Congress by voting themselves and pocketing two years' back salary. (Long-continued applause.) On February 12, 1873, it was signed by the President and enrolled as a law, with the dollar the size of the French five-franc piece left out, and with mints barred to the silver dollar that had always theretofore had free access, and with the only silver coin that entitled silver freely to enter the mints with gold erased from the bill. When the country should attempt to return to specie payments, as it afterward did, it would not mean specie payments with two metals, but with one metal.

Mr. Horr: Mr. Harvey, when you say that that bill as it came from the House contained the provision for the 384 grain silver dollar, and that silver had free access

to the mint for the coinage of such dollars in that bill, what do you mean?

MR. HARVEY: I mean that it was understood by the members of both houses that were paying attention to the discussion of that bill that it was in there, and that it was in there.

MR. HORR: Do you mean to say that that bill as it came from the House and went to the Senate provided for the free coinage of such a dollar as that, the same as it did for gold coins, and that it was not put in the bill and made subject to all the conditions that were applied to half-dollars and quarter-dollars and subsidiary coins?

MR. HARVEY: I claim that it was in the bill the same as gold, and was entitled to free access to the mint.

MR. HORR: "Free access to the mint" is a quibble. I say to Mr. Harvey, if you will show in any way that that 384 grain dollar was to be given free coinage in this country I will give you my time to do it in.

MR. HARVEY: I have shown it already.

MR. HORR: He can't do it, because there isn't a word of truth in that proposition. Look at the philosophy of it. You can charge a man with a thing that is such nonsense that you can't believe he would have done it unless you also conclude that he is a fool. That is one of those propositions. That is, that the Congress of the United States were providing for a smaller silver dollar than we had ever had. Now mark: This new dollar that was provided for in the bill in the House as it went to the Senate was just twice the size of the half-dollar. Am I right? Ain't that true? Don't you know, Mr. Harvey?

MR. HARVEY: That is right.

MR. HORR: Well, then, just say so. Now, the provi-

sion existed that the silver for making such half-dollars should be bought by the government, and that the seigniorage arising .from coining such money, which was worth less than its face, should go into the government treasury. Do you believe they provided for coin containing double the amount of the silver in the half-dollar and agreed to take all the silver that should come to the mint and coin it into such dollars, and in the same bill also provided that if it was coined into half-dollars the government should buy it? Now, if men have any sense, how much could the government buy under those circumstances? Let us be honest about this. They couldn't get a dollar, and you know it, anywhere in the United States. Men wouldn't go and sell their silver for the market price when the very bill would permit them to have it coined and give them a larger price for it. The thing is too ridiculous to be discussed by men who have any business sense. That is all there is about it. And a man must be entirely devoid of common, ordinary business sense to even make such a proposition to anybody. And the American Congress may be pretty much all of them corrupt, but they are not all of them fools. (Applause.) And if his claims were true they would have to be both corrupt and idiots at the same time. (Applause.)

But there are some things about which Mr. Harvey and myself differ and some about which we agree. He thinks that our forefathers established a single measure of value, and that that measure was 371¼ grains of pure silver, and that gold was made a simple companion metal of silver, and that its value was to be all the time measured by a silver dollar. I believe that those early patriots attempted to establish a measure of value out of two metals, gold and silver,

and that they supposed they had hit upon a ratio which would secure the use of both gold and silver dollars side by side. We agree that up to 1834 the measure of value in actual use in this country was the silver dollar. I assert that in 1834 the ratio was changed, that the gold dollar was made smaller. He admits that. I insist that when the gold dollar was cheapened it became the actual measure in this country and remained so up to the suspension of specie payments; that the silver dollar, though still a legal measure of value, was not used in this country as the actual measure after 1834. He denies that. We both agree that from 1862 to 1879 the domestic business of this country was done by using the greenback dollar as the measure of values, which was during none of those years equal in value to either the gold or the silver dollar. He states that in his book,—we both agree. Now mark. We both agree that in 1873 the coinage of silver dollars was stopped by law; and that since 1873, since the resumption of specie payments, the domestic and international business of this country has been done on a gold basis. We agree that Great Britain has been on a gold basis since 1816, no dispute about it. I claim that Germany ceased the coinage of silver in 1871, and he claims that it was not done until later, in 1873, but we both agree that since January, 1874, Germany has been entirely upon a gold basis. We agree that the nations which compose the Latin Union—to-wit: France, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy and Greece—are all of them to-day gold-standard countries. There is no dispute between us that British America and Australia are also gold-standard countries. We agree that Mexico, China, Japan and several of the Republics of South America are silver-standard nations. There is to-day no nation on the face of the

earth that is actually using a double standard. The actual measure of value in each of the countries of the world is either gold alone or silver alone, except in some countries where depreciated paper money is the only circulating medium and metal money is bought and sold as a commodity, just as was the case in this country during the suspension of specie payments. Mr. Harvey claims that the law of 1873 was secretly and fraudulently passed. He won't deny that he claims that. That I have denied and still deny. I say there is not a grain of truth in such a statement. But we both agree that the law was passed and is in force to-day. Now the important question before the American people at this moment, and the one we are here to discuss, is this: Ought the law to be repealed? Ought we to again throw open the mints of the United States to free coinage of silver, upon the old ratio of 16 to 1, when the actual ratio of value in the markets of the world is fully 30 to 1?

Mr. Harvey: When I have read the printed record of what Mr. Horr has just now said, it will be time enough for me to take up a new subject. I am not done with the present subject yet.

The act of 1853 served the purpose of the men who were seeking to overthrow our constitutional standard of money in this way. In 1853, on account of the exportation of our silver coins by reason of the French ratio of 15½ to 1 being less than ours—16 to 1—Congress, preserving the silver unit, ordered by act, that the fractional silver fifty cents and less should be cut down in size to the French ratio to stop its exportation. The silver unit was preserved and could be preserved without even coining a single one of them. It would regulate the other coins all the same.

Now this fractional silver had its legal-tender character taken away from it because it was not of full weight. It was not made full weight because of the exportation, and it was made non-legal-tender because it was not of full weight, awaiting further consideration whether we would go to the French ratio as a whole or not. So that when the bill in 1873 was being considered at a time when nobody was thinking about coins and very few knew anything about it, these men who were steering the bill said, "We are re-enacting the act of 1853. There can't be anything wrong about that." And that is what they made senators and congressmen believe they were doing, except that they were going to reduce the size of the silver dollar to put us on the French ratio; but talking to men who knew nothing about bimetallism or the previous history of coinage, the act of 1853 served their purpose to get its language in the bill concerning the fractional coin and the preceding clause that had the dollar in it into language of the act of 1873. So that all they had to do was to strike out the line that had the dollar in it in the words of the act of 1853, which was a free coinage dollar, and there you had an act without any free coinage silver in it.

Now, with that explanation, I proceed. I want all the men and women of America to read the words uttered in the two Houses of Congress on the day the bill passed, May 27, 1872, and January 17, 1873. It is the best school on this question that they can attend, the reading of it will cause them to agree with me. It can be found in the Congressional Record or in No. 7 of the Financial Series, published by the Coin Publishing Company of this city, wherein it is copied, and I hope all publishers of books on finance will include it in the appendix of every book they publish.

But I had not finished with my proofs. Proofs precede comments. Plain facts are more eloquent than words.

I have before me on this table the files of *The Chicago Tribune* for 1873. (Laughter.) I want Mr. Horr and his assistants to inspect it. I turn first to January 18, 1873. This bill that was supposed to have had in it a silver dollar that would float around the world was passed in the Senate on January 17, so that the morning papers of the 18th would contain any news, if there were any, showing that the fundamental laws of the government had been changed. The only reference that appears in that paper is in a press telegram from Washington, which is this; I read it:

"Mr. Sherman called up the bill to revise and amend the laws relating to mints, assay offices and coinage of the United States, which was amended and passed."

That is all, not another word.

One of the money metals of the United States, as is now conceded, was struck down by that bill; one of the moneys of the constitution had been overthrown; the dollar that had regulated all other coins had been abolished. A great war debt to be paid off, and one of our money resources for paying it had been destroyed. (Long-continued applause.)

No information of that fact was conveyed to the people through the newspapers of the country. (Applause.) The reporters at Washington did not know it; the congressmen as a whole did not know it. The money of the people that had served them well was destroyed, and I now challenge Mr. Horr to show me anywhere in the newspapers of the United States during the passage of the bill, which he says has no taint of fraud attached to it, where the people knew that a bill was being con-

sidered by Congress that was to destroy as money one-half of the money metal of the country or that they had passed such a bill.

I have charged that it was passed secretly. The fact that a fundamental law of the government had been reversed and that no information of it had gone to the people whose government it was, either before or after the passage of the bill, until it was discovered several years afterward, is one of the best evidences of its secret passage.

Mr. Horr: I desire to say that Mr. Harvey is mistaken when he says that the money of the people had been stricken down. I desire to say that he or anybody else who states that the passage of the law of 1873 ever resulted in curtailing the silver money in circulation in the United States (laughter on the silver side of the house) states something that is not true. (Applause on the gold side.) I desire to state that according to what "little Coin" said there had not been very much silver coin in his country up to that date. Listen. I read from page 152 of "Coin's School up to Date."

"Coin here explains how an error had crept into the official report of the Treasury of the United States for 1893 that had caused him to heretofore set his figure at $105,000,000."

The boy in the other school had stated that the coinage was only $105,000,000. He proceeds:

"Coin said that he had since forced the Treasury Department to correct that error and it now stood correctly stated in the report and footed up $143,465,150.70, which with the foreign silver coin in circulation during that period in this country—estimated at about $243,000,000—used in this country prior to 1873."

It is this statement which Mr. Harvey says that he is not responsible for, that "Coin" represents the whole

bimetallism of the United States, and that when "Coin" said that he forced the Treasury Department to correct its error, the boy lied, but, says Harvey, "I can't help it—you can't charge it to me."

Now whether that is true or not, he and I won't differ as to the fact that the Treasury Department had never reported it at $105,000,000. "Coin," the little fellow in his first school, had taken the wrong figures, his attention had been called to it, and, boy fashion, you know, instead of owning his mistake—as he would have done if he had been a full-grown man like Harvey—instead of that, he tries to get out of it by claiming that he had forced the Treasury Department to correct an error, when the Treasury Department had never made any error, and the error was his own. But that is immaterial. Such little things happen in the world once in a while. Boys sometimes try to get out of a trouble in that way; men do not, of course—never.

We all admit, however, that up to the passage of the law of 1873 there had only been about $143,000,000 of silver coined and that only about $8,000,000 of that were standard silver dollars.

This law passed in 1873, and under that we coined silver trade dollars—$36,000,000—for the benefit of the people of the United States. Not to circulate in this country—they were then worth too much—but to enable the producers of silver to use them in trade with China and the East.

All of this talk about striking down the money of the people is the merest rot—it is the only word that exactly covers that kind of bosh. The money of the people should be just as good as the money of the nabob, and before I get through I will show the people of the United States that I have come here to defend the rights

of the millions who live by work, whose wages would be cut in two by the passage of this law which my friend advocates. (Long-continued applause.)

I will now resume. I was just saying that Mr. Harvey and myself agree that the law of 1873 was passed. Dropping the matter of how it happened to be, the fact still exists.

THE QUESTION NOW BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

The important question before the American people at this moment, and the one we are here to discuss, is this: Ought the law to be repealed? Ought we to again throw open the mints of the United States to the free coinage of silver upon the old ratio of 16 to 1 when the actual ratio of value in the markets of the world is fully 30 to 1?

If Mr. Harvey—now listen—shall succeed in proving that the people of the United States in 1873 were mostly a set of corrupt scoundrels and that he is really the only pure and upright man left in the entire city of Chicago, it won't avail him anything in this debate. These questions are not pertinent to the questions in dispute. The law of 1873 did pass; it is to-day the law of the land. Several attempts have been made to repeal it in Congress and they have thus far all failed. Mr. Harvey claims that the law should be repealed at once and that this nation should instantly be placed upon a silver basis—that is, that 371¼ grains of pure silver should be made the only unit of value in the United States—now mark—and if the gold dollar shall prove to be more valuable than such a silver dollar, then the gold dollar should be reduced in size until the gold contained in it is worth no more than 371¼ grains of pure silver. You claim that in this book—that is, "Coin" does, and I supppose he won't deny that.

MR. HARVEY: You state me wrongly.

MR. HORR: Here the issue between us is clear cut and I oppose such legislation with all my soul and with all my strength. That is really the only question in dispute here between us.

In order to decide intelligently we must inquire somewhat into the doctrine of ratios. I now ask, is it possible by legal enactment to fix a ratio of value between two substances and then maintain such a ratio for any great length of time, either in the markets of the world or in the markets of the country where such law is enacted?

I pass to the discussion of the question of ratios as leading up to the correct solution of the dispute between us.

MR. HARVEY: We were discussing the question of whether the act of 1873 was secretly and surreptitiously passed, and I supposed that Mr. Horr would address himself to the fact that I called his attention to—that none of the people in the United States, including the newspaper reporters at Washington, knew that that bill had passed. His failure to reply to that is an admission that it was passed, so far as the papers were concerned, secretly and without their knowledge. (Long-continued applause.)

It means this: we are a republican government, a government of the people, and it is part of the policy and spirit of the government that when it is proposed to make a change in our laws affecting the welfare of the people, or changing a fundamental principle, it is to be discussed before the people, and the people are more or less to express themselves on it—not only know in advance that it is proposed to do such a thing, but know it when it is done; neither of which occurred in this instance.

When I reach the proper place we will see that what Mr. Horr has said here about the immense coinage of silver since 1873 has nothing to do with this question. You might as well print your token money on leather as to stamp it on demonetized metal. (Applause.)

When your demonetized metal becomes token money, representative money redeemable in gold, you are wasting material to stamp it on a valuable substance. (Applause.) Because it is gold that it represents, it has ceased to represent itself. (Applause.)

I am going to satisfy the people and Mr. Horr that there was something wrong about the passage of that bill.

Senator Thurman on the 15th of February, 1878, in debate, said:

"I cannot say what took place in the House, but know when the bill was pending in the Senate we thought it was simply a bill to reform the mint, regulate coinage and fix up one thing or another, and there is not a single man in the Senate, I think, unless a member of the committee from which the bill came, who had the slightest idea that it was even a squint toward demonetization." (Congressional Record, volume 7, part 2, 45th Congress, second session, page 1064.)

Senator Conklin, in the Senate, on March 30, 1876, during the remarks of Senator Bogy on the bill to amend the laws relating to legal tender of silver coin, in surprise, inquired:

"Will the senator allow me to ask him or some other senator a question? Is it true that there is now by law no American dollar? And, if so, is it true that the effect of this bill is to make half-dollars and quarter-dollars the only silver coins which can be used as legal tender?" (Congressional Record, volume 4, part 3, 44th Congress, first session, page 2062.)

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR ALLISON.

Senator Allison, on February 15, 1878, said:

"But when the secret history of this bill of 1873 comes to be told, it will disclose the fact that the House of Representatives intended to coin both gold and silver and intended to place both metals upon the French relation instead of on our own, which was the true scientific position in reference to this subject in 1873, but that bill afterward was doctored." (Applause.) (Congressional Record, volume 7, part 2, second session, page 1058.)

I call Mr. Horr's attention to what I have just read. There is the testimony of a man who was present and among the men who were deceived—Mr. Allison, at present senator from Iowa.

Passed, did you say, in your opening, without the least taint of suspicion of its integrity? (Long-continued applause.) And that the records would demonstrate that you were right?

What do you do with Senator Allison? He says that the bill was doctored. Haven't I proved to you that it was doctored, by the records of the Senate? He says that it was the intention of Congress to put our coinage system on the French ratio. Isn't that what I said, and isn't that what the bill would have done if it had passed, as I claim, with the silver dollar in there that Senator Sherman himself said, when pulled out of his hole, was on the French relation?

I want you when you rise here again to address yourself to the language of Senator Allison. (Applause.)

Mr. Holman, in a speech delivered in the House of Representatives, July 13, 1876, said:

"I have before me the record of the proceedings of this House on the passage of that measure, a record which no man can read without being convinced that the measure and the method of its passage through the House, was a 'colossal swindle.' I assert that the measure never had the sanction of this house, and it does not possess the moral force of law." (Congressional Record, volume

4, part 6, 44th Congress, first session, appendix, page 193.)

I want you, Mr. Horr, to make good your assertion that that bill had not about it the least taint of suspicion, and in making it good I want you to explain what Mr. Holman says about its being a "colossal swindle."

Again on August 5, 1873, he says:

"The original bill was simply a bill to organize a Bureau of Mines and Coinage. The bill which finally passed the House, and which ultimately became a law, was certainly not read to the House. It was never considered before the House as it passed. Up to the time the bill came before the House for final passage, the measure had simply been one to establish a bureau of mines, I believe I use the term correctly now. It came from the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures. The substitute which finally became a law was never read, and is subject to the charge made against it by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Bland), that it was passed by the House without a knowledge of its provisions, especially upon that of coinage. I myself asked the question of Mr. Hooper, who stood near where I am now standing, whether it changed the law in regard to coinage, and the answer of Mr. Hooper certainly left the impression upon the whole House that the subject of the coinage was not affected by the bill." (Congressional Record, volume 4, part 6, 44th Congress, first session, page 5237.)

Mr. Horr: I desire to say to the gentleman that just what one congressman or another may have said about this bill I neither know nor care. (Applause from the gold side; derisive laughter from the silver side.) I know this, that the men composing the Congress of 1873 personally and individually have every one of them denied the statement of corruption that you charge in the passage of this bill. I know that you have nothing but innuendoes to base the charge upon. I know that

you cannot make a case unless you first prove that no decency was left in the American Congress in 1873. (Laughter.) Oh, I know what I am talking about. In order to make out their case they must make out that the best men of this nation were a set of villains and have been for the last twenty-five years. (Cries of "No, no.") Harvey proposes to do that.

MR. HARVEY: No, I don't.

MR. HORR: He has attempted it. I say that every charge that he has made against the members of the American Congress is false. (Cries of "No, no.")

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not proper for anybody in the audience to interrupt the speaker.

MR. HARVEY: That is so. Don't do that.

MR. HORR: I am well acquainted with you gentlemen. It is not the first time I have met you face to face. The disease which you men have got always breaks out by running at the mouth. (Long laughter and applause.) It is one of the symptoms that shows the silver craze, it is the same old craze with the same symptoms that affected the Greenback party, and there is where Harvey first came down with it when he was young. (Laughter and applause.)

Now I proceed. I am not to be diverted from completing this debate sometime during this year.

I propose to take up now the question of ratio.

MR. HARVEY: Would you let me finish on this subject, and then we can go along together on the ratio, if you will hold back so as to get this out of the way?

MR. HORR: I couldn't do that. If he wants to still keep barking at that old hole let him bark. I am proceeding to discuss the question before us.

THE RATIO BETWEEN GOLD AND SILVER.

There has been an effort among the civilized nations

of the world from the earliest days of history to try and do business by using gold and silver as money. There has been always an attempt among all these people to fix some ratio between the real value of gold and silver, so as to use both metals indiscriminately. That effort commenced at a very early date.

I have with me the great bimetallic authority on this question, a gentleman whose book my friend has quoted from in this debate before, A. Del Mar of London, published by the Royal Exchange. He gives a very carefully prepared statement showing how these two metals have been separating in value from the very earliest dates.

I want to call Brother Harvey's attention to this fact: Del Mar tells us that in the archaic epoch, in the very earliest days, where the records were kept on the papyri of Boulak, silver and gold were equal in value, one exchangeable for the other. At that time an ounce of gold was worth just as much as an ounce of silver. People cared nothing as to which one they received. He then tells us in the Vedic epoch silver had depreciated so that it took four ounces of silver to buy one of gold. He next tells us that in the Braminical epoch, that was in 1650 B. C., the ratio was 5 to 1, and in 1367 the ratio in some of the countries of the East was 6 to 1. In the second Buddhic epoch, 521 B. C., it had changed to 6½ to 1. In India it was 6¼ to 1 and remained so for long years. In 700 A. D., in India it rose,—that is, lowered the price of silver to 6½. In 1150 the ratio had become 8 to 1. In Marco Polo, Middle Ages, he tells us that in 1290 it varied in different countries from 4 to 1 even to 10 to 1, different countries had different ratios, in 1295 in the Jul-al-ad-din epoch the ratio had got to be 7 to 1. In 1351 again it went back

to 6½; but again it went up in India to 7. Now he gives the limit in the days of Akbar the Great 9½ to 1, then it went down to 9 and was for a long time 9. The East India companies lowered the value of silver and put it 10 to 1; in the days of the India Company that was the ratio for a long time. In 1769 in the coinage of mohurs at the Indian mints, the ratio was down to 14 to 1. I say now, silver was cheaper all the while in Bombay and Bengal from 1489, 10 to 1.

It rose in Spain at one time to 6¼ to 1. In France it was 14, then 15, then 15½ to 1. We started with the ratio in this country of 15 to 1. We then adopted 16 to 1. During the entire Roman Empire it was at first 10 to 1, then 12 to 1, and Senator Stewart in his debate states that the records of the Babylonian kingdoms show that during those long years the ratio was 13½ to 1.

Now, Brother Harvey, I want you to explain to the American people how it is that silver from the dawn of civilization to the present day has constantly been growing cheaper? Why is it that it has constantly been taking more silver to buy the same amount of gold? Tell us why the ratio between silver and gold did not always remain 1 to 1? I want you to explain how it happened that the more civilized a nation has become in the past the cheaper silver has been in that nation, and that in the country where there is little civilization, where their wages are low, where the people are poor, silver has been used rather than gold, and to explain to me why it is that to-day every civilized nation on the face of the earth has adopted the gold standard, and that the silver standard is only used in such countries as Mexico, Japan, China and the like. (Applause.)

CRAZES IN THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.

MR. HARVEY: To something that occurred in this au-

dience when Mr. Horr failed to reply to what Senator Allison and others said as to the manner of the passage of the act of 1873,—Mr. Horr said that your enthusiastic expression of manner was derogatory, or implied that it was, to your character or intelligence, and that it was a failing of men who had the silver craze,—Mr. Horr, I want to answer that right now.

There have been periods in the history of the United States when we have had crazes; one of those first instances when you might have used that language was just preceding the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill. (Loud applause.) There have been two or three instances since, and there is another coming (applause), when the integrity of the American people intends to restore the integrity of this nation and take it away from the men who are now driving us upon the reefs of disaster, and hurling ridicule at us because we exercise the rights of American citizens to investigate. (Cries of "Hear, hear," and applause.) We will arraign you and those men you defend for their acts, and when they come back at us with ridicule we will answer them with arguments. (Applause and cries of "Hear, hear.") When we have presented an argument to you so strong as that of Senator Allison and Holman, Grant, Blaine and others, that that act was a fraud, and you fail to answer it intelligently, you cannot answer it with ridicule. (Cries of "Hear, hear," and applause, and renewed applause.) I had intended to quote from Mr. Blaine, Garfield and many others on this subject, all in harmony with what I had read (cries of "Go on, go on"), but Mr. Horr's utter retreat in answering what I have read makes it unnecessary. (Applause.)

TESTIMONY OF THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

I now come nearer home for testimony. *The Chicago Tribune* of February 23, 1878, says:

"In 1873-4, as it was two years and more later discovered, the coinage of this silver dollar was forbidden, and silver dollars were demonetized by law. This act, which was done secretly and stealthily, to the profound ignorance of those who voted for it, and of the President who approved it, had, without the knowledge of the country, removed one of the landmarks of the government; had, under cover of darkness, abolished the constitutional dollar, and had arbitrarily, and to the immense injury of the people, added heavily to every form of indebtedness public and private." (Applause.)

On January 19, 1878, this same paper said:

"*Harper's Weekly* insists on the single gold standard, and has frequently denied that the silver dollar was demonetized surreptitiously or unknown to Congress and the country. But it appears from *Harper's* own files that nobody about that concern had the faintest conception as late as January 9, 1875, that silver had been demonetized. In the issue of that date Nast illustrated the 'Ark of State' floating toward a distant peak, just showing above the watery waste, on which is inscribed, 'A Sound Specie Basis—Gold and Silver,' while above gleams the bright rainbow of 'Our Credit.' This, recollect, was on the 9th of January, 1875, nearly two years after Doctor Linderman and his co-conspirators had sneaked the fraud through Congress, and up to that time neither Tom Nast nor George William Curtis nor Eugene Lawrence, the three editors of that publication, had yet an inkling of what the anti-silver conspirators had accomplished." (Applause.)

Gold standard men, this is what your beloved *Chicago Tribune* said (laughter) when it was honest. It now repeats what Mr. Horr says, and is publishing a one-sided report of this debate. (Cries of "Good, good," and applause.) A cause that depends on the suppression of the truth should not be the cause of honest men. (Long applause.)

I want the record of this debate to contain the proper reference to General Grant's letter on this subject. It is

in McPherson's Hand-Book, 1872-76, page 134, in which General Grant, eight months after the passage of this bill, says in a letter to Mr. Cowdrey: We have got the silver and it will soon commence coming to the mints, and with silver and gold we will pay our public debts. He goes on and shows in as plain language as you would have it stated, that he knew nothing of the passage of the act.

Twenty-two years have passed, it is but a moment in the flight of time, but we who lived then and who know now how the country was deceived will write the criminal records of these modern Benedict Arnolds of America. (Applause.)

The first question that strikes the innocent mind of to-day is, "Why has not this wrong been righted sooner?" It is because, sirs, men stand bare-headed beneath a sun whose enervating rays blind the eyes and destroy human character. The same deception which originated and completed this crime still is practiced upon the people, and the same power that directed it then is directing it now. (Applause.) The child of nature standing in the laboratory of the chemist can see the most deadly poison made, but its appearance furnishes no evidence of its deadly power. So it is with the man who reads the act of 1873; he does not understand the science of finance, he beholds a poison more deadly than any drug that destroys human life,—a poison that eats into the arteries and veins of the nation and destroys the lives and happiness of millions of people. Such has been the effect of the act of 1873 that debased one-half the money of the government. (Applause.) Its debasement consisted in destroying the attributes that gave to silver its value and power as a money metal. Its use since in debased token money has served to de-

ceive the people by making them believe that it is primary money while not treating it as such. (Applause.)

QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE.

This ended the debate for the day. Judge Miller then announced that questions would be received from the audience, which questions are as follow:

MR. HORR: I have a question from George H. Sibley, of Chicago, as follows: "You state in your opening address: 'I would have the money which measures value the most stable that can be devised.' My question is: Do you agree with Professor Jevons that the stability referred to is the ratio in which money exchanges for commodities? (See 'Money and the Mechanism of Exchange,' p. 30. Same effect, Professor Laughlin in 'Elements of Political Economy,' p. 73.)"

I cannot answer the question as to whether I agree with Jevons and Laughlin, from one little sentence taken out that way, because that might mislead me and mislead everybody else. You have to know enough about the position that a man actually takes before you can answer such a question as that. I can answer the question, though, so the questioner will understand—

A voice in the audience: "The straight principle—"

MR. HORR: You cannot ask the questions and answer them too; I am answering them. I mean money should be made of metal that is the most stable in value, that varies the least in a long series of years; that it is impossible to get any measure of value that is always precisely the same; and that money should be so arranged, if possible, that no variations of a large amount should ever take place in the measure suddenly; that what the people should guard against, and what the nation should

guard against, is a change which occurs suddenly; that there will be a little rise or little fall in the value must always be as long as commodities depend upon the supply and demand, the cost of production, for their values, and I want the metal to be used which is the most certain to remain stable, that is, that fluctuates the least.

Mr. Harvey: A question by Mr. H. L. Bliss, of Chicago: "As silver was in 1873 the dearer metal, please explain why the alleged conspirators did not demonetize gold. Were they gifted with prophecy, and did they foresee the enormously increased and cheapened production of silver?"

The answer to that is this: Concerted action by the money-changers around the thrones of European governments had commenced by demonetizing silver in England in 1816 and it would be easier to carry out the programme as started than to reverse it after having started it. To turn around and reverse the laws of England and demonetize gold would be something like trading horses while crossing a stream. They already had demonetization started on silver, which would avoid the necessity for an act being passed in England. Another reason: These men knew more about the production of silver and gold than you do; they made a study of it and knew that history for hundreds of years previous to 1850, which was in their possession, showed that silver produced more money than gold did, that the production had been larger than gold, and though gold had temporarily gotten ahead of silver in the quantity produced, beginning with the year 1850 and continuing up to 1873, they thought they could rely on a longer period showing that there would be more silver produced, as past history had shown, than there would be

gold, and for that reason preferred to demonetize silver.

Mr. Horr: A question by George S. Bowen, Elgin, Ill. "Is it not a fact that *The New York Tribune*, in whose employ you are, has charged the use of British money to induce a reduction of our tariff laws, and if so is it not as likely that British money has influenced financial legislation?"

My answer is that if *The New York Tribune* has at any time charged that any British money has been used for the purpose of purchasing or bribing members of Congress, I myself have no recollection of having ever read anything of the kind in that paper, and I read it pretty carefully. *The New York Tribune* may have charged that foreign manufacturers, and our home importers getting money from them, have used that money in political ways in supplying the bone and sinews for the party to get into power; that has been charged, I presume, more or less, but I do not believe that *The New York Tribune* or any reputable paper has charged corruption on the members of Congress in order to get financial legislation. I have served through the revision of the tariff twice and I never heard such a thing intimated within the walls of Congress nor within the city of Washington. I have heard intimations that the silver men kept a big lobby and paid out a good deal of money in order to put their business through, but I denounced them at the time as false, for I never had any evidence that they tried to buy a single congressman while I served in the American Congress, never.

Mr. Harvey: A question from C. C. Reed, of Chicago: "Does Mr. Harvey assert that there has not been sufficient honesty in the Congress of the United States since 1873 to correct the terrible crime which he charges?"

The people of the country are familiar with the his-

tory of legislation on this subject since the discovery of the demonetization of silver. The attempt to reverse that law began in 1876. Friends of silver were met in Congress by an enormous money lobby from New York City, and it resulted in a compromise known as the Bland bill in 1878, a bill that did not restore free coinage of silver. You are familiar with the influences that have been brought to bear to control Congress, and I am now going to quit the answer to this question by calling your attention to only one thing, and that is, that the people who have elected congressmen to go there to represent them have been deceived as to what that act of 1873 was and is and as to the effect of it; deceived until they were made to believe that their rights had not been interfered with. They were deceived. How? By newspapers such as *The Chicago Tribune*, by such articles as Mr. Horr wrote in *The New York Tribune*, wrote on this question, on the crime of 1873 (applause) saying that that bill was passed clearly and openly before Congress,and that nobody ever charged there was anything wrong, and he made it read so smoothly as to deceive thousands of honest farmers who were subscribers to *The New York Tribune*, and capital has spread these misleading representations which when they meet us face to face they cannot make good. They have now in New York what they call a Sound-Money League, where they are sending out cords of matter to the press over the country, misleading the people. The country newspapers are so hard up and they want to follow the leaders and at the same time save money in setting type that they are putting that infamous plate matter into their papers. They have carried on this deception for years that you see they have not made good when they meet us. And in that

way the people are deceived, and congressmen are elected and go to Washington never understanding this and therefore never having it in their heads or hearts to remedy that wrong.

A PROTEST FROM MR. HORR.

MR. HORR: I submit to the judges that it is out of order in answering questions for either party to attack the other—

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr, I did not mean to attack you.

MR. HORR, continuing:—to take advantage of a question asked in order to make a stump speech in reference to the private work I am doing. If that is legitimate then I have a right to defend myself. I had supposed that Mr. Harvey was above that kind of trick in order to get before the American people with that kind of slush. I answer questions, I don't commence pettifogging on something else.

JUDGE MILLER: If you rise to that point while he is talking, then the chair can decide it, but not after he is through.

MR. HARVEY: I want to put in the record that I meant no reflection on Mr. Horr, because I believe that he believed what he wrote, and that I only referred to his article in *The New York Tribune* as an instance in which both the writer and the people were deceived on this subject. (Laughter and cheers.)

MR. HORR: Add right after that that the reason—(cries and laughter.) Gentlemen, you cannot possibly choke me down by your howls. I have known you for too many years. I am here and on my feet, and I shall have my rights in spite of your discourtesy. My friends have not treated Mr. Harvey in a single instance with discourtesy, and I beg of them to be too much of gentlemen ever to attempt a thing of that kind.

Mr. Harvey: I have asked my friends not to interrupt Mr. Horr, and I hope they will not, and I don't know they intended to, but I have asked them to sit quietly and listen to what is said.

Judge Miller: I was about to remark on that, that I am advised that the roof of this room is not entirely safe, and I want to say to Mr. Horr that if anything occurs that annoys the speakers I will do my best to remedy it. I have not interfered with the cheers for the reason, as stated on the first day, this audience is the people, and this debate coming before the people of the United States, if it is interspersed or punctuated with cheers it reads better perhaps in their estimation than if it were all dry, and, therefore, it was preferred to have it appear that the points they make are appreciated by the audience they are addressing.

Mr. Horr: I say frankly I don't object to the cheering of Mr. Harvey in the least—cheer him whenever you please—but I do object that whenever I attempt to make an answer in a concise, straightforward way, you gentlemen set up yowls for the purpose of breaking me up and preventing me from being heard, and that is not gentlemanly and does not show good breeding in the men that do it.

Mr. Harvey: I don't think they intend to show you any disrespect.

Mr. Horr: I don't charge Mr. Harvey with being responsible, but that is the treatment I have received from the men who sympathize with him, and none of the friends here who seem to believe with me have shown that discourtesy to him in a single instance during this debate. That is what I say.

Judge Miller: I called the attention of the audience to that subject a few moments ago, and I do not think

it is necessary to dwell upon it now any further. I don't think you will be interrupted; I know they are all fair-minded men, and they do not desire to interrupt you, and I don't think you will have any difficulty of that kind from this time forth.

Mr. Horr: All I was about to say was that Mr. Harvey, in answering a question, stated to the audience that I, who was not supposed to have any opportunity to answer him, was misleading the people. He says that he did not intend to say that I did it dishonestly; I don't know that he did. I don't think he had any right to introduce my work in that way, in the answer of a question. I don't suppose Mr. Harvey would intimate to the audience that he thinks I am not doing what I honestly believe is best for this country. If I thought he would intimate that, I would not be in this debate with him. My life has been given up to hard work, and I never yet uttered a sentence, either when I wrote it and published it, or before the people, when I did not honestly believe what I uttered. I am good for nothing in this world, except to state my honest convictions. (Applause.) In reply to Mr. Harvey, as long as he said what he did, I will say to him that when he gets to be as old a man as I am, when he has seen as much of the adversities and the peculiarities of life, he will learn one lesson that I think will be of benefit to him, and that is, not always to try to attribute dishonesty to men who differ with him in opinion. I have found myself to have been wrong a good many times in my life. I propose always to be the first to acknowledge it; if I can, I will do it before I am charged with the mistake. I have often had to do it after I have been charged, because I never found it out before.

Mr. E. D. Stark, of Cleveland, asks me this question: "You have claimed that the act of 1873 was a good thing for this country; now, considering how the gold output was diminishing and silver increasing, our great war debt, greenbacks, etc., was payable in either metal, explain how demonetization was not advantageous to creditors, to England, and a hurt to the debtors of America."

I wish to say to Mr. Stark that before this debate is through, I shall try to answer that question, but that to undertake to answer it in 300 words, would simply be ridiculous. It embraces the entire question we are discussing here to-day, and he seems to want me to render a decision before I have heard what Mr. Harvey says; it would be impossible for me to do that.

Adjourned to Monday, July 22, 1895, at 1 o'clock P. M.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FIFTH DAY. THE MEASURE OF VALUE.

On Monday, July 22, at 1 P. M., the debating hall was well filled. Among the new attendants were Senator Kyle of North Dakota and Congressman Henry F. Thomas of Michigan. Mr. Charles H. Aldrich and Judge Miller occupied the platform.

JUDGE MILLER: Before the discussion commences will you allow me to say a few words to the audience? Gentlemen, you are here upon the invitation of the committee who has charge of these proceedings, and it is very important, very important indeed, that the very able contestants in this debate should receive every encouragement from you, and that perfect fairness and courtesy be accorded to each one. This I know is the wish of each of the very able gentlemen who is participating in this discussion. When either gentleman is on his feet addressing you, I beg of you not to interfere with the course of his thoughts by demonstrations of disapproval of whatever he is saying. It is very embarrassing to any gentleman who is addressing an audience to find, by the conduct of the audience, that the audience is not in sympathy with him. Be in sympathy with each speaker so far as to encourage him in the presentation of his side of the case. There have been instances when this rule has not been observed. I hope for the credit of our city and for the credit of this discussion you will observe these rules of courtesy, and that there will be

no unbecoming applause, no shouting, nothing of that kind. It is proper, perfectly, to make manifest your approval of the point made by either speaker, but do not let it be boisterous, for if it does become boisterous it is in the power of the audience to terminate this discussion, and I hope you will not do it. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: At the close of the debate on Saturday I had given the facts as to the constant depreciation of silver as compared with gold since the dawn of civilization. The civilized nations of the world have at some time or other all of them tried to fix a ratio so as to give free coinage to both metals. Through all ages the market or commercial value of the two metals has been a changing quantity, hence the ratio has been variable. A difference between the legal ratio and the commercial ratio of one-fourth of one per cent has been enough to drive the dearer metal out of any civilized country on the face of the earth.

History is full of efforts of governments to force a legal ratio upon the people, and there is no instance on record where the market value of each metal has not controlled in the end. The best money has always been driven from the field by the cheaper. Such result is in accordance with a law that is as universal and as unchangeable as the law of gravitation. Our forefathers tried the experiment and fixed the ratio at 15 to 1 in 1792. The commercial ratio at that time was about 15⅓ to 1, and our gold coins left us. In 1834 the legal ratio was changed to 16 to 1. The commercial ratio was at that time about 15¾ to 1, and our silver coins left us. This became so marked that in 1853 Congress passed a law for coining smaller silver coins of less value than either the legal or commercial ratio would indicate. They made such coins token money.

The government purchased the silver at its commercial value and covered the profit into the public Treasury. They gave no free coinage to silver used in such subsidiary coins. This is all history, which is disputed by none.

I know "Coin" says in his "Financial School," page 10:

"During this struggle to get more silver France made a bid for it by establishing a ratio of 15½ to 1, and as our ratio was 16 to 1 this made silver worth 103.8 cents when exchanged for gold, and as gold would answer the same purpose as silver for money it was found our silver was leaving us. So Congress, in 1853, had our silver coins made of light weight to prevent their being exported."

Coin, as usual, is not accurate. France did not bid for our silver by making her ratio at 15½ to 1 when ours was 16 to 1. France established the ratio of 15½ to 1 in 1803, and our ratio at that time and up to 1834 was 15 to 1. France could get no silver from us during those years on account of paying more for it, because our ratio was more in favor of silver than hers. But Coin here admits the Gresham law and gives the true reason for making our small coins token money.

France tried to maintain both metals as circulating mediums from 1113 to 1874 on some legal ratio, and between those dates France changed the mint price of the gold marc 146 times and the mint price of the silver marc 251 times, and thus changed the ratio a large number of times, and in 1726 she fixed her legal ratio at 14½ to 1. At that time she rated silver too high, and while England became a gold-standard country France became a silver-standard one. In 1803 she lowered the legal value of silver and fixed her ratio at 15½ to 1, where it is nominally to-day, but in 1874 she ceased the free

coinage of silver altogether. Here is the exact fact. The experience of the United States in an effort to establish and maintain a double standard has been the experience of the entire world.

During the nineteenth century all the great civilized and commercial nations on the face of the globe have adopted the gold standard and have done so without discontinuing silver as money, but all of them refused free coinage to silver at any ratio. They have done this because they believed gold to be the best metal for money purposes. They considered it less destructible. They have all of them claimed that it fluctuates less in value than any other commodity; that it has much more value in a smaller space than silver. Hence it is much more easily transported, especially in large sums, than is silver. Now, what is the use of our taking up time in examining long tables to see whether any nation ever succeeded in establishing any ratios and keeping such legal ratios in harmony with the market ratios? The table of ratios given by "Coin" himself on page 34 of his book shows that from 1803, when France established the ratio of 15½ to 1, up to 1874, when she stopped the free coinage of silver, in only one instance, and that was in 1861, did the commercial and legal ratios between the two metals agree. In only that one instance was the ratio of silver as 15½ to 1.

SUMMARY OF THE LAST DEBATE.

Mr. Harvey: When I reply to the essay which Mr. Horr has just read my answer will be full and complete. But I must pause for a moment to deal with a question which you will recognize the importance of. It is by way of summary of the debate at the last session. I have had many requests, both orally and by letter and

by telegrams, since the last session, to put into the record what Blaine, Garfield, Senator Beck of Kentucky, Senator Ingalls of Kansas and many others have said officially, either to the effect that the act of 1873 was the result of gross ignorance on the subject or that it was the result of fraud.

In view of the important topics yet before us and the limited number of words remaining at my disposal I will not do so, but will try to find space for this matter in my twenty-five hundred word summary at the close of the debate. But I do wish in a few words to dispose of a few witnesses produced by Mr. Horr to the fairness of that legislation. Those whom he first mentioned were the treasurer, the comptroller of the treasury and the director of the mint, all of whom soon after the expiration of their terms of office became prominent as national bankers. Outside of these he has called no witnesses who have, since 1873, spoken upon this question except a letter written in the last few days from an ex-congressman in Indiana, whose essential statements are contradicted by the Senate proceedings. With this exception he brings only one prominent witness. It is Senator Morrill of Vermont, over whom Mr. Horr pronounces a eulogy. Mr. Horr says of Senator Morrill, "If there is an honest, pure man inside the United States it is Justin S. Morrill." I am going to shatter the reputation of Mr. Horr's New England idol. Mr. Horr reads an extract from a letter from Senator Morrill in which the latter says that "Congress purposely omitted to provide for the further coinage of the silver dollar," now observe I read Senator Morrill's exact language, "none having been coined for nearly forty years." I now hand Mr. Horr a report of the director of the mint for 1891, open at page 212, and call his at-

tention to the number of silver dollars coined during the forty years next prior to 1873, and hand to the stenographer a copy of that report of the mint, showing the number of silver dollars coined for each of those years, to be inserted at this point in my remarks.

Year.	Silver dollars coined.
1833	
1834	
1835	
1836	$ 1,000
1837	
1838	
1839	300
1840	61,005
1841	173,000
1842	184,618
1843	165,100
1844	20,000
1845	24,500
1846	169,600
1847	140,750
1848	15,000
1849	62,600
1850	47,500
1851	1,300
1852	1,100
1853	46,110
1854	33,140
1855	26,000
1856	63,500
1857	94,000
1858	
1859	636,500
1860	733,930
1861	78,500
1862	12,099
1863	27,660
1864	31,170
1865	47,000

Year.	Silver dollars coined.
1866	$ 49,625
1867	60,325
1868	182,700
1869	424,300
1870	445,462
1871	1,117,136
1872	1,118,600

Look at them, Mr. Horr. See that in 1859 there were 636,000 of them coined; in 1860, 733,000 of them coined; in 1871, 1,117,000 of them; in 1872, 1,118,000; and in all those forty years silver dollars in large quantities were coined, except in six years. And when you answer me, Mr. Horr, tell us why Mr. Morrill said there were none coined; and if he was untruthful about that, what importance should be attached to what he said about the silver dollar being purposely omitted in the bill?

The secret of all this is that Senator Morrill is a bank stockholder and insurance company money-lender, and when giving utterance to the statement that serves his personal interest he has not had a strict regard for the truth.

I want to nail this statement at this point; not only to discredit the letter that Senator Morrill wrote and that was read here, but to nail that same statement that is being industriously published all over the country, and that has been reiterated here in Chicago, that there were no silver dollars coined for many years prior to 1873. There it is before Mr. Horr in the report of the director of the mint and as published in my remarks. I now pause for Mr. Horr to justify Senator Morrill in making the statement that no silver dollars had been coined for nearly forty years prior to the act of 1873. (Applause.)

MR. HORR: I desire to say in defense of Senator Morrill that the object of that letter was to deny the general fraudulent talk that was going about the country and originated by Mr. Harvey as much as any one else, that all who were connected with the Congress of 1873, or enough of them, were corrupt and were crowding the bill through Congress by the use of money. Now Senator Morrill did not intend by that expression to say that there was not one single dollar coined. He did mean to say that substantially there were none, and that is true. In the whole length of the time from the organization of this government up to 1873, as your book shows itself, there were less than eight million silver dollars coined. There were over six hundred million dollars of gold, if I mistake not. I speak now from my memory.

Senator Morrill simply used the expression, "There were none coined," and Mr. Harvey draws the conclusion that because that is not accurately true, he cannot tell the truth about anything else.

MR. HARVEY: Will you pardon me?

MR. HORR: Certainly.

MR. HARVEY: Isn't it true, as that statement shows, that there were several million coined and that they were coined largely every year except six years?

MR. HORR: Certainly, I do not dispute it, nor did Senator Morrill intend to. Mr. Morrill may have made a mistake in the exact words he used. (Applause on the silver side of the house.) Now wait a moment. You made a mistake when you quoted the amount from the Philadelphia mint, and made a bad mistake. (Applause on the gold side of the house.) Your attention was called to it, and, instead of owning up when you found yourself caught, you published that you had

forced the treasury department at Washington to correct the mistake. (Applause.) Wait till I get through. There wasn't one word of truth in your last statement. Now if you argue right about Morrill, because he didn't speak the truth, then I have a right to assume that you cannot tell the truth now. (Applause.)

MR. HARVEY: May I answer you now?

MR. HORR: Certainly.

MR. HARVEY: Isn't it a fact that "Coin's Financial School" states that the silver coinage prior to 1873 was $105,000,000?

MR. HORR: Yes.

MR. HARVEY: And isn't it a fact that the error when corrected states it at $143,000,000?

MR. HORR: Yes.

MR. HARVEY: And was not that error in "Coin's Financial School" against me and not in my favor?

MR. HORR: Certainly it was. Then why didn't you have the manhood to say, "I made a mistake, and when I found out my mistake I corrected it"? That would have been the straightforward thing to do. You are making the same mistake that Brother Carlisle, as you charged the other day, did. You charged him with having once been a free silver man and now advocating a different doctrine. You were right about that; Carlisle made the mistake of not owning that he once did preach that kind of stuff and that he now thinks he was wrong then and right now. If you had done the same thing in your second book you would not have had all this trouble squirming around about that mistake you made.

Now I do not reflect—I don't desire to—on Mr. Harvey. I know Senator Morrill; I know him as I know my own father and brothers. I would take his word

on any subject as quickly as that of any man living on the face of the globe. Many men who served in that Congress of 1873 have denied this doctrine of corruption from one end of this nation to the other, and my friend hangs his case upon making out that that bill was purchased through Congress by bribery. He has not brought a scintilla of proof on that subject, there isn't any in existence, not a particle. It is all a fabrication, every word of it, and what I object to is adopting a theory that compels you to smirch the character of every man that differs from you.

Now he sneeringly says: "Senator Morrill is an owner of bank stock." Does that affect a man's character for truth and honesty? Is it against a man to save a little something and to put it into good stock? I am not a stockholder in a national bank. I wish I was. I would be ever so glad to be one, and if you know of anybody, Harvey, that you are afraid is being corrupted with any, and who wants to dispose of it, I wish you would refer him to me. I will run the risk of corruption. The idea that because a member of Congress, a senator of thirty years' standing, has also been frugal and has become the owner of stock in some banking institution, that, therefore, he is not to be believed, I submit it is too contemptible for men to teach in any argument of this kind. (Applause.)

Doctor Linderman, formerly director of the mint, gives the exact value of the silver dollar each year from 1834 to 1876 in the Senate Report. It is a little, short statement, and I purpose to put it in the record.

Year.	Gold equivalent of a silver dollar. Cents.	Year.	Gold equivalent of a silver dollar. Cents.
1834	101.62	1856	103.95
1835	101.20	1857	104.69
1836	101.72	1858	103.95
1837	100.98	1859	105.22
1838	100.88	1860	104.58
1839	102.36	1861	103.10
1840	102.36	1862	104.36
1841	101.83	1863	104.06
1842	100.77	1864	104.06
1843	100.34	1865	103.52
1844	100.88	1866	103.63
1845	100.46	1867	102.67
1846	100 56	1868	102.57
1847	101.20	1869	102.47
1848	100.88	1870	102.67
1849	101.30	1871	102.57
1850	101.83	1872	102 25
1851	103.42	1873	100.46
1852	102.57	1874	98.86
1853	104.26	1875	96.43
1854	104.26	1876	89.22
1855	103.95		

According to that table, at no time was the silver dollar between 1834 and 1876 worth less than 100.2 cents; the highest one was in 1859, when it was worth 105.22. This Coin calls a slight variation; but you remember one-fourth of one per cent premium is sufficient to drive the higher-priced coin out of the country, then you can imagine what would have taken place when the premium was twenty-one times that, and what would now take place when the gold dollar is worth two hundred times one-fourth of one per cent more than the silver dollar.

MR. HARVEY: In raising the question of the quantity of silver coined in thirty or forty years prior to 1873, I do it to establish a landmark in the financial discus-

sion in the United States. The people have been misled; and at each step in this discussion, when we can set them right, the debate has been of value. The gold men are represented here by Mr. Horr, and when I show him and you that silver was copiously coined during the forty years prior to 1873, and he admits it, as he must, then that question is settled. And when Professor Laughlin or any other gold-standard advocate represents that nothing but gold was being used prior to 1873, and that no silver was in circulation, as they have persistently been misrepresenting this question, you now have the answer to it, and you have it in such an emphatic way with the other side here represented, that it eliminates that question from the future financial discussion.

I do not mean to reflect upon the integrity of any man because he is a banker by what I said of Mr. Morrill; but we are all students of human nature, and this financial controversy is an excellent field for this study, and when a man makes an avowed misrepresentation, such as Mr. Morrill did, it is not improper for me to call your attention to the fact that when a man is personally interested in a political issue he is not good authority, and that men from the highest walks of life to the lowest are swerved in their opinions, as proved by experience, by their personal interests.

A DEFINITION OF BIMETALLISM.

I now begin the discussion of bimetallism. Scientific bimetallism is this:

1. Free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver; these two metals to constitute the primary or redemption money of the government.

2. Silver dollars of 371¼ grains of pure silver (with

us) to be the unit of value and gold to be coined into money at a ratio to be changed, if necessary, from time to time if the commercial parity to the legal ratio shall be affected by the action of foreign countries.

3. The money coined from both metals to be legal-tender in the payment of all debts.

4. The option as to which of the two moneys is to be paid in the liquidation of the debt to rest with the debtor, and the government also to exercise that option when desirable in paying out redemption money. (Applause.)

All of these conditions are necessary. Like any useful mechanical construction, all the parts are necessary.

First, as to unlimited coinage: When the mints are open to unlimited coinage of the two metals, an unlimited demand is created for them. The quantity is limited. When these two metals seek a market they find a demand for their use in the arts and manufactures, which is limited. The surplus finds an unlimited market at the mints to be coined into money, the object for which all other products seek the market. They thus have an unlimited market, as the mints are open to all that comes. It is a question of supply and demand. Supply of precious metals is limited. When the mints are open an unlimited demand is created. This demand is limited only by the capacity of the business of the country to absorb money.

With a limited supply and unlimited demand, what stops their value rising? It is this: The law says, "We coin 371¼ grains pure silver and 23.2 grains pure gold, respectively, into dollars, and confer upon these coins functions which make for them a permanent and equal demand." When this is the law, people will not take less for silver and gold—the quantities above named—

than a dollar of current money, for they have the right to have it coined into dollars. The law fixes the quantity in the dollar, and the unlimited demand holds it firmly to that point. In this respect money is a creation of law. Without this law there is a demand for the metal. The law adds a new use and a new demand for it. (Applause.)

This unlimited demand for the two metals existed in all the world up to 1816, when England closed her mints to silver. The demand thus made fixed the commercial value of the two metals at the ratio fixed by law. England closing her mints had practically no effect. She was at that time the greatest commercial nation in the world, but the commerce and trade of the other nations were sufficient to absorb all the surplus of both metals, and the closing of the English mints to silver made no difference. It was designed to do so and was the beginning of the movement intended to limit the quantity of primary money to one of the metals and correspondingly decrease the value of the other metal.

In 1854 Germany and Austria closed their mints to gold; but it had no effect on the relative commercial value of the two metals, as the demand for these metals for money in the countries whose mints were open was a sufficient demand to hold them relatively steady.

It is not necessary to speak of the influences that were at work to get rid of one of the metals. We are dealing with the question of unlimited demand as created by the open mints of one or more great countries whose use for money is sufficient to absorb all the surplus, if any, of these two metals.

I now make a part of my remarks an official table taken from page 108 of "Compiled Laws and Coinage Statistics," an official document from Washington,

COMMERCIAL RATIO OF SILVER TO GOLD EACH YEAR SINCE 1687.

From 1687 to 1832 the ratios are taken from Dr. A. Soetbeer; from 1833 to 1878 from Pixley and Abell's tables, and from 1879 to 1890 from daily cablegrams from London to the Bureau of the Mint.

Republished from the Coinage Laws of the United States, 1792 to 1894. See U. S. Senate Report No. 235, p. 108.

Year	Ratio	Year	Ratio	Year	Ratio	Year	Ratio	Year	Ratio	Year	Ratio
1687	14.94	1722	15.17	1757	14.87	1792	15.17	1827	15.74	1862	15.35
1688	14.94	1723	15.20	1758	14.85	1793	15.00	1828	15.78	1863	15.37
1689	15.02	1724	15.11	1759	14.15	1794	15.37	1829	15.78	1864	15.37
1690	15.02	1725	15.11	1760	14.14	1795	15.55	1830	15.82	1865	15.44
1691	14.98	1726	15.15	1761	14.54	1796	15.65	1831	15.72	1866	15.43
1692	14.92	1727	15.24	1762	15.27	1797	15.41	1832	15.73	1867	15.57
1693	14.83	1728	15.11	1763	14.99	1798	15.59	1833	15.93	1868	15.59
1694	14.87	1729	14.92	1764	14.70	1799	15.74	1834	15.73	1869	15.60
1695	15.02	1730	14.81	1765	14.83	1800	15.68	1835	15.80	1870	15.57
1696	15.00	1731	14.94	1766	14.80	1801	15.46	1836	15.72	1871	15.57
1697	15.20	1732	15.09	1767	14.85	1802	15.26	1837	15.83	1872	15.63
1698	15.07	1733	15.18	1768	14.80	1803	15.41	1838	15.85	1873	**15 92**
1699	14.94	1734	15.39	1769	14.72	1804	15.41	1839	15.62	1874	**16.17**
1700	14.81	1735	15.41	1770	14.62	1805	15.79	1840	15.62	1875	**16.59**
1701	15.07	1736	15.18	1771	14.66	1806	15.52	1841	15.70	1876	**17.88**
1702	15.52	1737	15.02	1772	14.52	1807	15.43	1842	15.87	1877	**17.22**
1703	15.17	1738	14.91	1773	14.62	1808	16.08	1843	15.93	1878	**17.94**
1704	15.22	1739	14.91	1774	14.62	1809	15.96	1844	15.85	1879	**18.40**
1705	15.11	1740	14.94	1775	14.72	1810	15.77	1845	15.92	1880	**18 05**
1706	15.27	1741	14.92	1776	14.55	1811	15.53	1846	15.90	1881	**18 16**
1707	15.44	1742	14.85	1777	14.54	1812	16.11	1847	15.80	1882	**18.19**
1708	15.41	1743	14.85	1778	14.68	1813	16.25	1848	15.85	1883	**18 64**
1709	15 31	1744	14.87	1779	14.80	1814	15.04	1849	15.78	1884	**18.57**
1710	15.22	1745	14.98	1780	14.72	1815	15.26	1850	15.70	1885	**19.41**
1711	15.29	1746	15.13	1781	14.78	1816	15.28	1851	15.46	1886	**20.78**
1712	15.31	1747	15.26	1782	14.42	1817	15.11	1852	15.59	1887	**21.13**
1713	15.24	1748	15.11	1783	14.48	1818	15.35	1853	15.33	1888	**21.99**
1714	15.13	1749	14.80	1784	14.70	1819	15.33	1854	15.33	1889	**22.10**
1715	15.11	1750	14.55	1785	14.92	1820	15.62	1855	15.38	1890	**19.76**
1716	15.09	1751	14.39	1786	14.96	1821	15.95	1856	15.38	1891	**20.92**
1717	15.13	1752	14.54	1787	14.92	1822	15.80	1857	15.27	1892	**23.72**
1718	15.11	1753	14.54	1788	14.65	1823	15.84	1858	15.38	1893	**26.49**
1719	15.09	1754	14.48	1789	14.75	1824	15.82	1859	15.19	1894	**32.56***
1720	15.04	1755	14.68	1790	15.04	1825	15.70	1860	15.29		
1721	15.05	1756	14.94	1791	15.05	1826	15.76	1861	15.50		

DEMONETIZATION

*NOTE.—I have added the ratio for 1894. See the U. S. Statistical Abstract of 1894, page 34.

showing the commercial ratio of the two metals for two hundred years, to which I have added the commercial ratio for 1894. I now hand the book to Mr. Horr. I wish to give those present an opportunity to see this table, and now distribute copies of it in the audience. From this table it will be seen that under the effect of unlimited coinage up to 1873 a parity between the two metals was maintained at the legal ratio. England closing her mints in 1816 to silver, and Germany and Austria in 1854 to gold, had no perceptible effect. Cast your eyes up and down these columns and see how evenly the commercial ratio kept pace with the legal ratio. The ratio of France, the largest nation commercially during that period, having a bimetallic ratio, was the governing influence, which was 15½ to 1; ours was 15 to 1 till 1834, then 16 to 1. I will in a few minutes explain to you how these figures in that table were at a parity of commercial ratio with the legal ratio of France.

Mr. Horr: All these inquiries about the variation in the ratio of the past are of little account in this debate. This one fact is admitted by Coin and disputed by no one: All the civilized nations of the world have ceased the free coinage of silver upon any ratio. Silver to-day has no free coinage in any country where gold is the standard, and only in such countries as are using silver as the unit and measure of value. It is admitted by all, so far as I know, that the real measure of value in the commerce between nations is a grain of gold. All gold coins of all nations pass, and for that matter gold in all forms passes current and the value of such coin or piece is determined by the number of grains of pure gold contained in the same without regard to the shape in which it may be found. That, understand me, is in the international balances of the world in commercial

transactions. The balances between nations, then, are all calculated on a gold basis; silver is used as money in all the nations of the world, but in the civilized countries only as a medium of exchange, and not as a measure of value. It matters little how such a state of affairs has been established, since it is the existing fact, hence all this talk about what has been done in the past about ratios, and even as to what has caused the low price of silver to-day, is of little consequence. Silver is cheap. We both agree to that. The great commercial nations of the world all refuse to use it as the measure of value, we don't dispute about that, and hence they are all to-day refusing it free coinage. No coins which are of less value than the market values of the metals in them would indicate, are ever treated as the measure of ultimate redemption or ever passed current at their face value, except they are redeemable in money which is worth as much uncoined as coined. Hence it is impossible to make silver the money of redemption in a nation doing business on a gold basis, except at its commercial value in gold, and it is useless to attempt to make gold the money of redemption in a country on a silver basis except at its commercial value. Now "Coin" in his "Financial School," really admits that the ratio between the two metals must always be determined by the actual value of the metals in the markets of the world, and ignores the doctrine of the ratio of 16 to 1 being possible at the present day. On page 111 "Coin" says:

"We express values in dollars, the unit of our monetary system. That unit is now the gold dollar of 23 1-5 grains of pure gold, or 25 4-5 grains of standard gold. If we were to cut this amount in two, and make $11\frac{6}{10}$ grains pure gold a unit or dollar, we would thereby double the value of all the property in the United States except debts."

CUTTING THE YARDSTICK IN TWO.

Is not that statement wisdom for you in chunks? (Laughter and applause.) What a head that boy must have! Precisely such another proposition would be: We measure cloth in this country, legally, with a yard-stick thirty-six inches long. If we were to cut the yardstick in two, and declare by law that eighteen inches shall hereafter be a yard, we would thereby double the amount of cloth in the United States. (Laughter and applause.) Holy Moses! What a philosopher we have here! Then cut it in two again and the cloth would be quadrupled. That would beat any loom yet invented for the production of cloth! (Laughter and applause.) If the boy had said that by cutting the gold dollar into two pieces and then changing our unit or dollar so that it should be only half as valuable as it is now, we would double the nominal value of all the property in the world, but would not affect its actual value in the least, he would have told the truth. The idea that you can double the property of the world by making the unit or measure smaller is too idiotic to talk about. If that proposition is true you can increase the value of the property in this country a hundred-fold by simply calling cents dollars. Such stuff may do, Brother Harvey, for an inspired boy, an urchin who is pure as a babe, but it would never be uttered by any grown man who had his head under his control. Before Mr. Harvey finishes his book he discloses what he really meant by bimetallism. We have it here in his own language, and it is in this book that I find the principles which I am called upon in this debate to combat. The author says:

"The objection to independent bimetallism is that the parity between the two metals cannot be maintained

at our ratio of 16 to 1, that is, the gold 23.2 grains in the gold dollar will be worth more than the silver 371¼ grains in the silver dollar; we have twice changed the quantity of gold in the gold dollar, each time making it less. If the commercial value of 23.2 grains of gold is more than the commercial value of 371¼ grains of pure silver then reduce it to 22 grains, 21, 20 grains or less, if necessary, to put the two at a ratio where the practical effect of free coinage, when once set to working again, will demonstrate that the ratio is at its natural point, and parity easily obtained. Reducing the gold in the gold dollar would leave gold for more dollars, and this would assist in establishing rising prices, as it would multiply the number of dollars."

And then again on page 143 he says:

"With silver remonetized, and a just and equitable standard of values, we can, if necessary, by act of Congress, reduce the number of grains in a gold dollar till it is of the same value as the silver dollar. (Applause.) We can legislate the premium out of gold. (Applause.)"

You see Mr. Harvey applauds himself when there isn't anybody around, just as you chaps do when all of us are here.

"Who will say that this is not an effective remedy? I pause for reply."

That don't say applause. I wish you would cheer that. (Laughter and applause.) Now, then, what becomes of his ratio of 16 to 1? Here is what he virtually says: The gold dollar may be cut down if need be so that the ratio shall be 16 to ½. If silver remains as cheap as it is to-day he will then retain the 16. Somehow he seems to be stuck on "sweet sixteen." The boy's mathematics, however, are as defective as his veracity. Mathematically 16 to ½ is the same as 32 to 1, so it is not the ratio he cares about.

MR. HARVEY: You don't mean to say that I say in the book that I'm in favor of a ratio of 16 to ½?

Mr. Horr: What I have said is that you practically say it.

Mr. Harvey: That is your language.

Mr. Horr: Yes, you do say that if necessary to get the actual ratio and the legal ratio together, cut the gold out until you bring them together. That is what you say. I don't know how low you would go. (Laughter.)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr's diverting this argument by going to the last chapter in the "School" will serve him no purpose, for when we have ascertained what bimetallism is, and have reached the place that he has last spoken of, it will be time enough for me to answer Mr. Horr as to the last proposition here made. (Applause.) Mr. Horr says that I deny that the two metals can be kept in circulation at a fixed ratio. I have not said that, for they can be, as they have been in this country. I know they have attempted to make you believe that there was no gold in circulation up to 1834, and that there was no silver in circulation in this country or seeking the mints after 1850, but both were misrepresentations, as the report of the director of the mint shows both metals were in circulation, and, as our old citizens know, silver was in circulation before the suspension of specie payments in 1861. Mr. Horr flies in the face of history when he says that silver was not used prior to 1873 as a measure of value. It was under our law, and all other laws except that of England, linked with gold; both were measures of value,—the two metals combined were the measure of values. Neither metal depended on the other. We had a right to pay a debt in either metal, as Mr. Horr admitted the other day when that question was asked. Like a man walking on two legs, the man depends on both legs for stability,

When both metals were treated alike under the law, we depended on both metals, and the two combined were the measure of values of property. Silver was the unit in our coinage system regulating the size of the gold coins, but the two together were the measure of values, and that is what we mean by the double standard. We do not mean to say that we were on a silver standard when we called your attention so forcibly to the silver unit. The unit was fixed to regulate the coins under our coinage system; but gold and silver together, both with unlimited right to the mints, both legal-tender for the full amount as made by the laws of 1792, were the measure of values of all other property, and you had a right to pay a debt in either.

THE YARDSTICK DOUBLED.

Mr. Horr alludes to something that I have said before, and then adds, "Cut the yardstick half in two and it will make twice as many yards of cloth in the world." Now, Mr. Horr, let me tell you what you people did in 1873. You doubled the length of the yardstick. (Applause.) For instance, let me illustrate it. Suppose one-half of the gold in the world were destroyed to-day beyond recovery, would not the gold dollars that were left be twice as valuable as they were before? Mr. Horr is a bad pupil, and shakes his head. Let me illustrate it in another way that every farmer in this country will understand. Suppose that one-half of the wheat in the world to-day were destroyed beyond recovery. Mr. Horr, would not wheat on the Chicago market to-morrow be about double in value what it is to-day? You cannot escape that proposition, and it does not require a man to be a farmer to understand the illustration, and any man who is a business man will understand the gold illustration. (Applause.)

So that when you destroyed one-half the redemption money in 1873 you doubled the value of the money that was left. (Applause.) You doubled the yardstick. You can see no harm in destroying the price of a man's property; cutting the price of his property in two. You shut your eyes to that. But your eyes are wide open when any man proposes to even up with you in your cutting-in-half process by proposing to cut the gold dollar half in two.

We don't wish to do either. We wish to put back in the coinage system the money that you demonetized in 1873. (Applause.) Cast your eyes again on the table that I distributed among you, and you will see that an exact commercial parity with a given ratio is not to be expected. Why? If all the silver in the world were suddenly transformed into gold, there would not be an exact commercial parity between New York gold and London gold. There is not now. If exchanges of gold were in favor of London, the New York gold would not be worth as much in London as London gold by the cost of expressage and insurance from New York to London. As measured in par money at a given point the money of the world at different points will vary according to the demand for it at that point; it may be at a premium and it may be at a discount, and the cost of transferring it will measure that premium or discount. A sudden or abnormal demand in New York may make exchange on London sell higher than the cost of expressage and insurance.

So when the world practically had bimetallism, by the action of a few large nations, silver and gold fluctuated in the London market as the demand arose of one above the other according to the cost of exchange payable in that metal. The greatest difference in the relative value

as shown on the table is at a time when exchange, say for gold, was one day up or down and silver exchange the reverse, the whole difference being made by the cost of exchange. Neither would it rise higher or fall lower than this, for there was an equal exchange of the two metals to be had at the French ratio, and one could go there and make the exchange at the cost of doing it.

MR. HORR: Is it possible that my friend Harvey believes what he says—that the act of 1873, when it demonetized silver, cut the price of the property of the world in two, and that prices immediately, as they must have done if his statement is true, dropped fifty per cent?

I was around in the world in 1873 and I know that did not take place, and he knows it. You destroy one-half the wheat in the world and the chances are that you will increase the value of wheat probably four times—such is the estimate of political economists—but wheat is an article that people have to eat to live, it is all consumed from year to year, or after a short time. Gold has been accumulating for ages, and if you should destroy the primary money quality of half the gold in the world you would not change the price of the metal one-half. As soon as the price would go up there is an enormous store laid away all over the entire world that is not being used for money purposes, that would at once seek the channels and be coined into money and take the place of the money that had been destroyed.

But I cannot be diverted from my talk. What I read from "Coin's Financial School" when I was on my feet before was for the purpose of getting at exactly what the author of the book desires to reach by the free coinage of silver. It did not come in the first part

of the book; you did not tell them what you were after at first or I would have quoted it at first. I was compelled to quote it from the part of the book where you put it in, you know. But you ought to be able to state what you mean as well toward the end of the book as at the first. I do not see what that has to do with your real position.

Now I was just going to tell what that quotation proved—if I am wrong, stop me.

What "Coin" is really after is a cheap dollar. He would reduce at one stroke, if need be, the value of the money unit of this country one-half. If that is not adopting a fifty-cent dollar, what is it?

Now, I am here to protest against the whole scheme because it is an effort to cheapen labor. That civilization is the highest, I care not in what part of the world you seek for examples, you will find that civilization is the highest where the best wages are paid for human effort, both mental and physical. Now, I hope my opponent will give me attention.

The real measure of values is human toil. To decide whether any system of finances is best you must inquire into its effect upon the toiling millions. (Applause.) The greatest commodity ever placed on the markets of the world is labor. To know whether gold has appreciated or depreciated in real value, the price paid for any human effort must never be omitted. Under which system will each day's labor bring the most comforts of life to the greatest number of human beings? That is the vital question which we should attend to. (Applause.) Is it best to cheapen the unit of value, decrease the purchasing value of our dollar? Will such action harm or bless the mass of our people? That is the only question in dispute,

Mr. Harvey, between you and myself. You say the dollar buys too much of the product of labor. I say the effort of the human race is continually to better the condition of all people. The tendency of true civilization is constantly to decrease the cost of the products of labor and constantly to increase the wages for work.

Some men say the two things cannot go together. They say so because they do not understand the law of human progress. Every invention that lessens the amount of human toil in any production thus makes it possible to produce an article cheaper and still do so at a profit, though increased wages are given to the men who still do the hand labor required. When the laws of nature through mechanical devices are compelled to do the work formerly done by human hands, three results should follow. The product should be cheapened for the consumers of the world, the wages of the men who still labor in that production should be increased, and the profits of the promoter of the enterprise, or the inventor of the improvement, should become greater.

I am a believer in cheap prices and only oppose them when the cheapening of the price is at the expense of the men who do the work, and my entire opposition to this entire plan of my opponent is that he proposes to cut in two the wages received by the men who work, because, having been a laboring man until my head is entirely white, I have learned the fact which every political economist states and none deny—that the last thing which is advanced under a cheapening process of the money standard is always the wages of the men who do the work of the world.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr argues that the dear dollar is of more benefit to laborers than a cheaper dollar. The terms dearer and cheaper are relative terms, as com-

pared with your property and your services. If he is right that a dearer dollar is the best and the dearer it gets the better it is—because his argument must be followed to its logical conclusion—then we might find some metal in the world that is scarcer than gold and dearer than gold, with which a laboring man could purchase more than he can at present with the gold dollar.

Mr Horr, we do not intend to let you, before the American people, cloak yourself behind the laboring man. (Applause.) You have cut in two the number of days that it is possible for men to find labor; you have put anywhere from two to four million laboring men out of employment in this country entirely, and to those laboring men who are now destitute, and many of whose leaders are now lying in jail, you sing the sweet songs of the high purchasing power of the gold dollar—when he gets it.

Mr. Horr, there have been free schools in this country for many years and you are not going to fool the laboring men of this country. When I get to it in its logical place I will demonstrate the exact position of the gold standard to the laboring man.

Mr. Horr asks me about prices, why they did not drop suddenly fifty per cent in 1873 when silver was demonetized. The reply to that is this: We were not then on a specie basis. We began again in 1879, the demand for gold was not thrown on it to answer the entire purpose of primary money until 1879, and then it was cushioned in this country by the disputed position of silver.

The commercial parity of silver with gold in 1879 was so near together, not having fallen but about 15 per cent, that its effect was not so seriously felt and for a number of years silver hung, as it were, like Mohammed's coffin, between the ceiling and the floor.

It was hard to tell where its true position was, so many misrepresentations were made in regard to it. About the same position was occupied by silver in the balance of the commercial nations. They had demonetized it until the demand that had prior to that time been on both gold and silver in Europe, and partly in America, was gradually shifted from both of the metals to gold alone. It is only in the last three or four years that it has been pronounced, and the treasurer at Washington has construed the statutes made for that purpose, to be that gold alone is our redemption money.

He says my illustration about half the gold being destroyed is not like the wheat if one-half of that were suddenly destroyed. In this whole argument you can apply one safe principle, and that is, that supply and demand regulate values, and if the supply is cut in two, and the demand remains at what it was before, that it does affect the rise in the price of an article the same as it would in the illustration of wheat, whether it be gold or any other article.

THE RATIO BETWEEN THE METALS.

I now return to the question of ratio and bimetallism. In the table distributed among you, you will see that the commercial parity widened a little about the period 1834, when the ratio was changed from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1 in this country. Mr. Horr said that I said that thereafter the French ratio was a bid for our silver, and that our silver began to leave us, and undertook to poke fun at that argument by saying that France fixed her ratio in 1803, and (the argument was) the bid had been made thirty-one years before my proposition would hold true.

Now, Mr. Horr, my proposition is correct. In 1803 France was engaged in a war with England that block-

aded all her ports, and no ratio that France could have fixed would have affected our silver ratio in this country. And that war continued until about 1820, until the great Napoleon, as the sacrifice of English selfishness, was incarcerated on the Island of St. Helena, and it was several years after that before France got on her feet as a commercial nation and her ratio began to pull on us for our silver. (Applause.)

One word now as to how the cost of exchange only accounted for the fluctuation of ratio in this table. Suppose we had bimetallism in this country now, and our action had caused this nation to absorb all the surplus silver in the world, which it would do, a merchant in London rushes to his bank to get silver to ship to the United States to pay a debt he owes here. The banker tells him there is no silver in London to be had; that the action of the United States in throwing its mints open and making silver money has kept all the silver at home. "Last year," continues the banker, "they sent us $37,000,000 worth of silver and we had it to throw to the birds." (See "United States Statistical Abstract" for 1894, page 58.) "But they have made it money now with full money power, and it is passing among them the same as gold did." "What am I to do?" asks the merchant. "Use gold," replies the banker, "or pay a premium equal to the cost of our shipping the silver there, and we will give you exchange payable in silver."

It is a condition like this in the London bullion markets that made the commercial ratio in the table shown you fluctuate but slightly prior to 1873, when the mints of this government were open to the unlimited coinage of silver. During all that period of nearly 200 years, as shown in the table, there was a practical parity between the two metals. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: I quoted the exact words from "Coin's Financial School." What "Coin" said then I supposed for the purposes of this debate Brother Harvey would stick to now. You said:

"During this struggle to get more silver France made a bid for it by establishing a ratio of 15½ to 1, and as our ratio was 16 to 1, this made silver worth more," etc.

Now, I submit that you attempted by that book to teach the people of the United States that as soon as we, or after we, had raised our ratio to 16, France made a bid by putting her ratio, and paying one-half more for silver, putting it at 15½, and that she got our silver away from us by doing that. The fact is that she didn't change her ratio at all, that her ratio had been changed thirty-one years previous to our establishing 16 to 1. And now, he says, France was blockaded at that time. Well, suppose she was, she didn't change her coinage in order to underbid us for silver if it had already been changed, did she? That is the thing. It is not so very important,—I wanted more to see whether you could possibly get courage just to say, "I was mistaken about that, now it is pointed out to me; I am sorry I said it." That's all.

Now, to go on with the talk that I was making: My friend Harvey says that he is not going to permit me to stand behind the laboring men, or hide behind them, or words to that effect. How are you going to stop me from standing where I have a mind to? (Laughter.) Who gave you the power to dictate to me just where I shall stand? (Applause.) I know the laboring people of this country as well as you do, and if they permit me to stand behind them you cannot keep me from doing it if you try. I say I oppose this whole scheme because it will injure every man who lives upon wages in

the United States, and I am going to prove that as we go on in this debate.

LABOR THE MEASURE OF VALUE.

I had just commenced to tell you my idea about labor being the real measure of values. I have little doubt that the first unit of value, when one was adopted, was determined by the amount of human effort required to produce it. When men came to trade they did it by barter, an exchange of one commodity for another, which was in reality only an exchange of one man's labor for another. For ages no other kind of commerce was known to the world. Such a thing as money had not at that early day been dreamed of, which is simply saying that no substance had yet come to be used as a general medium of exchange—in other words, nothing had yet been discovered which would be received by all people in exchange for any and all articles, and which would pass from hand to hand everywhere as the measure of value, or would be hoarded that it might be used as money at some future time. Later in the growth of the human race gold and silver were selected as such articles and came to be used as money simply because they possessed qualities that adapted them to that purpose, and the cost in human labor of producing them measured the value of each. It was at that time simply an exchange of work, hence the only thing that could have been considered in making the exchange was quantity and quality, weight and fineness. If not in exact words, at any rate in effect, parties agreed upon how much toil a horse represented, and then they would agree upon how much gold or silver represented the same amount of human effort, and the exchange took place.

I want this audience to understand this principle: Money at first received its entire value from the labor represented in it, and the reason gold and silver came to be used was because each one represented a certain amount of work, and when people wanted to make exchanges their only effort was that they should get in exchange as much honest toil as they gave. Now, any statesman or philosopher who examines the question and proposes any mode of action, and leaves out of his calculation how his plan will affect the pay for labor, ignores the most important part of this subject and is giving his attention to a mere side-show.

My first criticism of this whole business of Brother Harvey and all the silver advocates is this: They leave out of the question the great human product, labor, and the manner in which it will be affected by the legislation that they propose. Their whole plan seems to be to enable people who have run into debt to pay their debts without returning full value for what they have received, and nowhere do they take into account the much larger army of the human family who live week in and week out on their daily earnings. I have received letters, two or three of them, asking "What do you mean, Mr. Horr, when you say that the creditors of the country outnumber the debtors, five to one?" What do I mean? Why, I mean to tell the truth. I might have expressed it a great deal stronger than that. All the men who commence their daily toil, the first hour they have labored, have become creditors for the work they have done.

Mr. Harvey: If the reader of this debate will bear with me until we examine scientifically what a monetary system should be, I will make plain this labor question. I want first to examine the science of money.

Mr. Horr can take all the credit out of this discussion that he can get, when I am through with the labor question, but for the present I ask your indulgence—let us first see what bimetallism is. Another word. I will force Mr. Horr, when I get to it, to retreat from his position that the creditors of this country outnumber the debtors. (Applause.)

MR. HORR: You will have a good time.

MR. HARVEY: And I think he will do it voluntarily when I get there. I will also force him from his position that increasing the primary money of the country, as we would do it, is only in the interest of the debtor. I will then call his attention to the merchants and manufacturers of this country who have been doing business for twenty-two years on a falling market, who purchased their goods last year, for instance, and find this year that the price has fallen so that they cannot sell them for more than what they cost them (applause), or so nearly those figures that there was no profit left in the business to them, but a loss. The examination of that question and its result upon the manufacturing, mercantile and trading business of the country is startling, and it will certainly be very interesting to Mr. Horr when I give him the census figures on it.

Germany followed the United States in demonetization in July, 1873, and France and the Latin Union in January, 1874. It has been said that Germany demonetized silver in 1871. In that year she called in all the silver coins of the confederation and issued a common coin of the empire, and her mints were left open to unlimited coinage of silver till July, 1873. (Applause.) To say that Germany demonetized silver in 1871 is like the statement that we demonetized silver in 1853. (Applause.)

So when France closed her mints in January, 1874, the mints of no large country were open to silver. Its price then began to ease off. Go back to the table now, giving the commercial ratio of the two metals for two hundred years, and see how they parted company; beginning with 1873, gradually the commercial ratio widened. One ounce of gold soon brought eighteen ounces of silver, then twenty ounces, and now, at the end of a short period of twenty-two years, one ounce of gold will buy thirty-two and one-half ounces of silver. For two hundred years under bimetallism there was a parity. Under the gold standard in twenty-two years there is a total destruction of parity.

I now distribute among you a table showing the average price of silver as measured in gold in London from 1833 to 1894, taken from page 34 of the "United States Statistical Abstract for 1894," and hand the book to Mr. Horr.

The price given is in pence, but you can see that the decline began in 1873, and you can see the ruinously low price to which they have now broken down silver. The movement designed by them in 1816 had now been brought into operation. From this you will see that the average price of an ounce of silver in London as priced in gold, from 1833 to 1873, was about sixty-one pence, and remained at that price with slight variations; while now, under the effect of demonetization, it is twenty-eight and seven-eighths pence; and that the decline began with 1873. It has now reached its logical level. With relatively only one-half as much primary money in existence now as in 1873, it is naturally worth only one-half as much, and as a commodity is without the fixity that monetization gave to it.

We thus see what the opening of the mints to the

ANNUAL PRICE OF SILVER IN LONDON, PER OUNCE.
1833 to 1894.

[From Production of Gold and Silver in the U. S, 1894, Preston.]
(See Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1894, Pg. 34.)

Calendar Year.	Average Quotation.	Calendar Year.	Average Quotation.
	Pence.		*Pence.*
1833	59 3/16	1864	61 3/8
1834	59 15/16	1865	61 1/16
1835	59 11/16	1866	61 1/8
1836	60	1867	60 9/16
1837	59 9/16	1868	60 1/2
1838	59 1/2	1869	60 7/16
1839	60 3/8	1870	60 9/16
1840	60 3/8	1871	60 1/2
1841	60 1/16	1872	60 5/16
1842	59 7/16	1873	59 1/4
1843	59 3/16	1874	58 5/16
1844	59 1/2	1875	56 7/8
1845	59 1/4	1876	52 3/4
1846	59 5/16	1877	54 13/16
1847	59 11/16	1878	52 9/16
1848	59 1/2	1879	51 1/4
1849	59 3/4	1880	52 1/4
1850	61 1/16	1881	51 15/16
1851	61	1882	51 13/16
1852	60 1/2	1883	50 5/8
1853	61 1/2	1884	50 3/4
1854	61 1/2	1885	48 9/16
1855	61 5/16	1886	45 3/8
1856	61 5/16	1887	44 5/8
1857	61 3/4	1888	42 7/8
1858	61 5/16	1889	41 11/16
1859	62 1/16	1890	47 3/4
1860	61 11/16	1891	45 1/16
1861	60 13/16	1892	39 3/4
1862	61 7/16	1893	35 9/16
1863	61 3/8	1894	28 7/8

DEMONETIZATION.

unlimited demand of these metals means. It creates a demand, an unlimited demand; just as grinding wheat into flour makes a use for wheat and a demand for it that it would not otherwise have; so we coin silver into money—real money, not token money—and it makes a use for silver that it would not otherwise have. It increases the demand for it. Demand gives value. Hence the unlimited demand for silver that is given by unlimited coinage. Did this breaking down in silver come from any other cause? It is said it is due to overproduction. Mr. Horr has relieved us during this discussion on that subject. He said that silver was not demonetized because of over-production. (Applause.) But has silver declined since 1873 by reason of overproduction? Let us see. The varying supply of the two metals prior to 1873 never had any effect in changing their commercial parity from the legal ratio fixed. The power of law to create a demand for either was stronger than the changing relative production. (Applause.) When one became scarce and attempted to rise in value the demand for it was withdrawn and went over to the other metal. I now distribute among you a table showing the relative production of silver and gold, taken from page 442 of the official book from Washington designated "Coinage Laws with Appendix of Statistics relating to Coins and Currency." The table covers a period of 349 years. I now pass the book to Mr. Horr. And the table printed on sheets is now being distributed among you and is a copy of the page in the book to which I refer Mr. Horr. I now make it part of my remarks. [See next page.]

Mr. Horr: I desire to state to Mr. Harvey that he either misinterpreted me or I misspoke myself if I said in answer to the question asked me that silver had been

WORLD'S PRODUCTION OF GOLD AND SILVER IN KILOGRAMS.

Reprinted from the Coinage Laws of the United States 1792 to 1894. See United States Senate Report, No. 235, p. 442.

The figures for 1545-1882, both years inclusive, are Soetbeer's; those for 1882-1891 are from the reports of the Director of the Mint.

Period.	Mean Annual Product.		Ratio of silver to gold (weight).	Ratio of gold to silver (value).*
	Gold.	Silver.		
	Kilos.	*Kilos.*		
1545-1560	8,510	311,600	36.6	11.30
1561-1580	6,840	299,500	43.8	11.50
1581-1600	7,380	418,900	56.8	11.80
1601-1620	8,520	422,900	49.6	12.25
1621-1640	8,300	393,600	47.4	14.
1641-1660	8,770	366,300	41.8	14.50
1661-1680	9,260	337,000	36.4	15.
1680-1700	10,765	341,900	31.8	14.97
1701-1720	12,820	355,600	27.7	15.21
1721-1740	19,080	431,200	22.6	15.08
1741-1760	24,610	533,145	21.7	14.75
1761-1780	20,705	652,710	31.5	14.73
1781-1800	17,790	879,060	49.4	15.09
1801-1810	17,778	894,150	50 3	15.61
1811-1820	11,445	540,770	47 2	15.51
1821-1830	14,216	460,560	32.4	15.80
1831-1840	20,289	596,450	29.4	15.75
1841-1850	54,759	780,415	14.3	15.83
1851-1855	193,388	886,115	4.4	15.41
1856-1860	201,750	904,990	4.5	15 29
1861-1865	185,057	1,101,150	5.9	15.41
1866-1870	185,026	1,339,085	6.9	15.50
1871-1875	173,904	1,969,425	11.3	15.98
1876	165,956	2,323,779	14.0	17.88
1877	179,445	2,388,612	13.3	17.22
1878	185,847	2,551,364	13.7	17.94
1879	167,307	2,507,507	15.0	18.40
1880	163,515	2,479,998	15.2	18.05
1881	158,864	2,592,639	16.3	18.16
1882	148,475	2,769,065	18.6	18.19
1883	144,727	2,746,123	19.0	18.64
1884	153,193	2,788,727	18.2	18.57
1885	159,289	2,993,805	18.8	19.41
1886	159,741	2,902,471	18.2	20.78
1887	159,155	2,990,398	18.8	21.13
1888	159,809	3,388,606	21.2	21.99
1889	185,809	3,901,809	21.0	22.09
1890	181,256	4,180,532	23.1	19.76
1891	189,824	4,479,649	23.6	20.92
June, 1893 (average)			18.6	30.18

*The ratio here given is the commercial ratio, not the coinage ratio.

demonetized by the nations of the world on account of its growing cheaper. That wasn't the question asked me. The question asked me, as I remember it, was: Did the people of this country in 1873 demonetize silver on account of its over-production? Now, right here,—I stated then and I state again now, that the nations of the world which first demonetized silver gave as the reason that they did it because gold is a better measure of values and a better metal to be used in the great transactions of the world than silver is. I repeat it. England in 1816 demonetized silver. Did any one ever claim that she did it because silver was cheap or because it was scarce? At that time nothing of the kind, so far as I know, was mentioned by any one who discussed the question. Mr. Harvey seems to forget that the question of the impossibility of keeping up a double standard of measures had been argued in this country for one century. The great philosophers of the world—the greatest philosophers of the world—had said over and over again that a double standard or measure of value was as impossible as a double standard of weight. Locke had said so, Sir Isaac Newton had said so, Copernicus had written a book and said so. Every man—so far as I know—of brains in those early centuries had written that it was impossible to do business with two measures of value.

Now, Brother Harvey omits this one important thing. You may make two standards by law, but the people will discard one and use the other. We necessarily are compelled to do business with one or the other unless the value happens to be precisely the same so that the measure becomes one and identical.

Now that question had been long discussed, and England decided that as long as they must take one or the

other, they preferred gold. A conference met in 1867, which I referred to and read to you about, where nearly all the civilized nations of the world were in session and discussed the subject, and, with one exception, they were in favor of a single standard, and that a gold standard.

Now the question of whether there was an over-production of silver never entered into that conference at all, nor is it referred to in the report of Mr. Knox, where he recommends the passage of the bill. The only thing that is referred to is the instability of the two metals and the better quality of gold for great commercial transactions.

Now, I admit that it has been oftentimes asserted that silver was demonetized on account of over-production, and I do not know but I may myself have said something of that kind, because I have not always been as well posted on this question as I am now, and sometimes when I don't know as much as I ought to I say things that I think are true, and I afterward find out that I was wrong, and then I back out like a man. I don't try to dodge my statements, and if he finds something from me looking as though I said that was the reason—if I said so I was mistaken, and I will try to correct myself right now. Other nations, however, did give that as a reason later on. Silver began to decrease in value, the production began to be immense, it increased so rapidly that other nations took the course they did for two reasons; first that they considered it unsafe metal to use on account of its fluctuations, and, second, that they had the proof right on hand of which nations did not know in the first place when they commenced to demonetize silver.

Now, I was surprised to hear Mr. Harvey before the

American people announce the proposition that we had thrown the people of this nation out of work by the demonetization of silver. I don't know but he thinks so. If he does I don't blame him for saying so, but if he will study the question as I have he will change his mind.

He tells us truly that it was in 1879 when the question of metallic money became prominent in this country. We resumed specie payment in that year and the only money of final redemption was gold. People had come to find it out. Do you tell me, Mr. Harvey, that distress was abroad in the land from that on? I was here at that time in this country of ours, you know, I have never been out of the country. Any man who says that must be ignorant of the history of work in the United States.

I make this proposition to Mr. Harvey: Since this nation began, the years from 1879 to 1892 found our people better employed and at better wages than in any other same number of years since this government was formed. (Applause.) I know what I am talking about. Four million men to-day out of employment! Faugh! Where did you get your figures? Did that inspired baby give them to you? They must correspond with some of the other mathematics that I shall get to in that book.

MR. HARVEY: I said from two to four million.

MR. HORR: Two to four million. Four million is out of the question. Two million is just about as bad. There isn't any truth in either statement. Some people are out of employment in this country. I was in the years 1889-90-91-92 in thirty-one states of this Union. I was in dozens of large cities in a great many of those thirty-one states, and during that entire time I did not visit a city where the people were not

well employed at good wages, and I know that any man who says that from 1879 to 1892 this country was in financial distress and that the laboring men were not then well employed, is not well qualified to talk upon the subject, because that is not the fact.

MR. HARVEY: My references to Mr. Horr's running argument will be brief until I have got into this debate what the reader should know with reference to the history of these two metals. I, however, congratulate the people of this country who are studying this question on Mr. Horr's frank admission that over-production cuts no figure in this controversy.

MR. HORR: I have never said that.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr said that when England demonetized silver in 1816, and when the Paris Conference was held, and when Dr. Linderman, and, as the *Tribune* calls them, his co-conspirators at Washington, advocated it, none of them mentioned or thought of the over-production of silver as a reason for it. I quote him correctly, I think, and the table that I have given you last so thoroughly disposes of that argument that I am not surprised at Mr. Horr for yielding that position. It is one of the remarkable instances wherein this debate is of great value to the people of the United States, that we eliminate these points as we go along.

It seems to worry Mr. Horr that I have not backed down yet on any fact or proposition stated in "Coin's Financial School," except in one instance, and that exception is what makes the worry the greater for him, because in that one instance where I said that the silver coined prior to 1873 was $105,000,000, the correction for the error shows that it is $143,000,000. The only error thus far that Mr. Horr has found in the book is an error that was against us. (Applause.)

Now, as to the prosperity of this country between 1879 and 1892. You could not break down a great nation like this in one year. It has taken a short period to bring us to the bitter cup of disappointment and distress. I know with each four years the political parties have charged each other with having destroyed the prosperity of the previous four years. (Applause and laughter.) In 1884 the Democrats arraigned the Republicans with being responsible for the terribly hard times, and on that they put in Mr. Cleveland. But in 1888 you came back at the Democrats and you arraigned them for the terrible disaster that spread from ocean to ocean. (Applause and laughter.) And the poor workingman who was out of employment, and the people knowing that something was wrong, but not knowing what it was, believed what you said, Mr. Horr, and the Republican orators, and they voted the Democrats out. Why? Because of the distress in this country resulting from some unknown cause, and Mr. Harrison was elected. But when 1892 came then came the Democrats and accused you, Mr. Horr, and the Republicans, of all the sins that were then piled upon the people, and the people again, knowing that something was wrong, but not knowing what it was, believed that Mr. Harrison and his party were responsible for it, and voted them out.

Now, since 1892, a flood of calamities has come. No, don't you in this debate refer to the prosperity of this country from 1873 to 1895.

The word "tramp" was coined in 1873, and the United States census shows that depression has been increasing at a disproportionate ratio. So has the number of penitentiary convicts, persons confined in all classes of prisons, insane asylums, and of suicides.

No, don't you refer to the prosperity that has built up millionaires and multi-millionaires and strewed this country with millions of tramps and paupers and men that don't know how they are going to provide for their families in the coming year. (Applause.)

Referring to that table I last gave you, the fourth column gives the world's quantity ratio between gold and silver produced in the world. The fifth column gives the commercial ratio. Between 1545 and 1560, the quantity ratio was $36\frac{6}{10}$ of silver to 1 of gold. Between 1581 and 1600 it was $56\frac{8}{10}$ of silver to 1 of gold. From that time on down to 1850, the relative proportion fluctuates. From 1800 to 1810, it is $50\frac{3}{10}$ of silver to 1 of gold.

By 1850 a sudden change sets in and the relative quantity that year is only $14\frac{3}{10}$ of silver to 1 of gold. By 1855 the relative production has fallen to only $4\frac{4}{10}$ of silver to 1 of gold. Then it rises again, and in 1893 it is $18\frac{6}{10}$ of silver to 1 of gold. In 1871-75, at the period of demonetization, it is $11\frac{3}{10}$ to 1 of gold; less than 16 of silver to 1 of gold at the very time of demonetization.

This table covers a period prior to 1873 of 328 years. In that time the quantity ratio between the two metals fluctuated, as we see, enormously—from 56 to 1 to 4 to 1—and yet the commercial ratio hung tenaciously to the legal ratio. A change in relative production had no effect as long as the mints were open to the two metals. (Applause.)

Now, observe the change in the commercial ratio (the fifth column) that came after demonetization. The closing of the mints in the short space of twenty years (1873 to 1893) pulled it away from the moorings of over three hundred years and advanced it from 15.98 of sil-

ver to 1 of gold in 1873 to 30.18 of silver to 1 of gold in 1893, while for that period the change in the quantity was less than at any time in the previous 345 years.

It is idle to comment on this table; it is a study for the student itself.

MR. HORR: I desire right now to see if I can state my proposition so plainly that Brother Harvey will cease to misquote me, or attempt to drive me into a position which I do not occupy.

I have never said that the cheap price of silver was not on account of its over-production, I have never intimated anything of the kind; and in order that you may understand me and have it last over twenty-four hours, I will tell you now, silver has become cheap in this world just precisely the same as wheat and iron and zinc and lead and other articles have been cheapened, just precisely for the same reason. (Applause.) I want to state this proposition: All of these articles have been cheapened by the natural laws which govern the production of every substance known to the producers in the world.

MR. W. D. WILCOX of Chicago: How about gold?

MR. HORR: Gold the same. I am glad you asked me. That is a question I will answer right now. Gold has depreciated in value in less than one hundred years 50 per cent. It is cheaper now than it was in 1873. All articles that can be produced by inventions are cheaper than they were before the invention was made. Every method which brings machinery into play and puts less human toil into the production of any article cheapens that article. The whole trend of civilization is to cheapen human products, gold as well as silver and wheat. A large number of the articles to-day produced in the world have not been decreased in value at all by the

demonetization of silver, but simply because the laws of production have crowded down the price. How do I know that gold is cheaper than it was in 1873? I will tell you. Now, listen (addressing Mr. Wilcox)—you are a younger man than I am and you have a respectable face—I wish I could say as much for the crazy man beside you. As to the measure of value by human toil: The rate of wages, the amount of gold that a man can get for a certain number of hours' work, tells me whether gold has decreased in price or not. I can get to-day twice as much gold for a day's work following the plow as I did in 1849. The people of this country are paid in gold for their work; so they were in 1860. Wages are 70 per cent higher, paid in gold, for the same amount of work, than in 1860. Has not gold depreciated then when you measure it with the great commodity of human toil?

LABOR THE REAL MEASURE OF VALUES.

What I find fault with is that the silver men invariably leave out of their calculation this article of labor, and the article of labor is the greatest article known in the civilized world.

You think for a moment. Do you know how much would have to be produced in this great nation of ours to supply the necessities of life before we accumulate property at all? Before there is anything left for accumulated capital this nation alone has to be supplied with $15,000,000 of products. That much has to be produced daily by the workers of this country to supply the consumption of the people. Consequently the question of how labor is paid is a great question in this and every other country.

But there is another reason almost as good. Business

is active when men are all employed and when they get good pay for the work they do. You cut down the pay of labor and you paralyze the entire business of any nation. The men who do the work, especially in a Republic like ours, are the men who consume. A nation is prosperous and happy according to the amount of stuff it uses. You have thought of it, Brother Harvey? It is what a man consumes that does him good in this world, it is what he uses up; and in a system of finance which reduces the amount of consumption of the comforts of life as well as the necessities, there is something wrong. I admit I am personally interested in this question; I work for pay. It would make a good deal of difference to me when every month I receive a certain amount that will purchase the articles I need in my family and for my home consumption, to know that I get paid in money that will purchase for me the largest amount of such goods, and when you propose a system that attempts to pay me off with money that compels my children to go hungry, that compels my family to deprive themselves of the comforts of life, I protest against it; and before I get through with this debate—I give Mr. Harvey notice now—he says I will retreat from the proposition that more than half the people of this country are creditors—I give you good notice that I will retreat from nothing of the kind, and I will make it so plain that I am right that every man will, even though he be a silver man, agree with me.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr says that everything has been cheapened, including gold. To say that gold and products cheapen simultaneously is a financial contradiction. You buy gold by exchanging other property for it. When it takes more property to buy gold than

formerly, gold has risen. Instead of becoming cheaper, gold has become dearer. That is the case now. And yet Mr. Horr, by sophistry, reasons that it has become cheaper. He says to the laboring man: You can buy more with a gold dollar now than you ever could, and then turns to you and says that gold is growing cheaper all the time. He transforms himself at pleasure from a dear dollar advocate to a cheap dollar advocate. It reminds me of a story. I mean no disrespect to Mr. Horr, but the story is apt.

A negro went to a neighbor and got a pig. He started home with the pig in a sack and stopped at a saloon. While he was drinking and being entertained by the boys, the pig was taken out of the sack and a pup was put in, so when he left the saloon it was a pup instead of a pig he carried. When he reached home he discovered that he had a pup instead of a pig. He put the pup back into the sack and started at once for the neighbor's to see how it all happened, and on his way he stopped again at the saloon. He was again highly entertained, and the pup was taken out of the sack and the pig put back. When he reached the neighbor's he explained that it was all a mistake, that he had a pup instead of a pig, and emptying the sack, out rolled a pig. "Before God, massa," he said, "that pig can turn from a pig to a pup, and from a pup to a pig, as often as it wants to." (Laughter.)

With us now the price of services or property means the gold dollar or its equivalent. Price has a definite meaning. It is gold that property and labor is being priced in, it is not priced in labor, and the average human intellect will have to be reduced a little lower than it is now, before Mr. Horr can toll the people out on a limb and chop the limb off and mangle them any more

than they are now mangled. He is trying to lead you off on a theory that has no practical application as a monetary unit.

QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE.

This ended the debate for the day, and questions were submitted from the audience as follows:

MR. HORR: This question is put to me by Mr. John J. McGrath, treasurer of the Bricklayers' and Stone-masons' Union of Chicago. Is Mr. McGrath here? I do not know that I quite understand his question, but will read it.

"Why is it that the workingman's opportunity does not keep pace with his increased productiveness—if he produce five times what he did twenty years ago, ought he not to get five times the pay? In other words, what right has the dollar that its value (purchasing power) should be increased thereby?"

I do not understand the last line. I understand the import, however, of the general question. The trouble with that question is that Mr. McGrath assumes two or three things that may not be true. "Why is it that the workingman's opportunity does not keep pace with his increased productiveness?" I did not know but what it did. "If he produce five times what he did twenty years ago,"—well, I don't know as he does. Do you lay five times as many bricks as you used to lay thirty years ago? Can a man do that? It is a fair question. I did not know as you could do that.

MR. HARVEY: Didn't you state in your argument the other day that the productiveness had increased something like five times as much?

MR. HORR: I don't know, but whether I did or not I would say so now, but I did not say that each laboring

man produced five times as much, by any means. I stated before, and I will repeat it now, every invention that is made may increase productiveness twenty times, but not of the men that work at hand labor. I stated the law this morning, that whenever such invention is made a part of the profit should go to increase the pay of the laborer, part of it should go to the cheapening of the substance for those who consume it, and part of it should go to the inventor or manager, to pay him for his invention and for running the business. Now, Mr. McGrath, how much do you get a day for laying brick?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. McGrath handed me that question Saturday and asked me to see that it was put to you.

Mr. Horr: Is there any one in this audience who knows what bricklayers get here to-day for such work? I would like to know if any of these men who are cheering me or Mr. Harvey are bricklayers, or if they know how much bricklayers get now. My friend here says fifty cents an hour. That would be at the rate of five dollars for ten hours' work. I used to hire bricklayers for two dollars and twenty-five cents a day. They were paid in the currency of the country. They are getting now say four dollars a day and paid in gold. Does that show that gold has increased in price?

Mr. Harvey: They get it when they get work.

PROGRESS SINCE 1873.

Mr. Harvey: This question is by Mr. L. G. Powers, of Minnesota. "Do not the facts in the United States Census about farm tenants and owners show a steady progress for the toilers since 1873, and does not that progress contradict your statements about the effect of the silver legislation about that year?" Mr. Powers has not stated the facts with reference to that

census. The Census Bulletin is in my room, but I read just one paragraph, as I am limited to three hundred words, from an article in *Lippincott's Magazine* by an able writer who deals with the Census Bulletins on this subject of farmers. He says:

"Between 1880 and 1890 the number of owning farmers decreased in every New England state and the number of tenant farmers increased. In each of these states there was a marked increase in the percentage of farmers who plowed the fields of another man and in the sweat of whose brow somebody in Boston ate cake. In the six states, in the ten years, the owning farmers diminished 24,117 and the tenant farmers increased 7,246. The percentage of tenant farmers in Massachusetts, though not large in 1890, was nearly double what it was in 1880; over 17 per cent of the farmers in Vermont and Connecticut and 25 per cent of the farmers in Rhode Island were tenants in 1890. In each of the four middle states the number of owning farmers decreased and the number of tenant farmers increased. In the group the owners decreased 42,304 and the tenants increased 24,075. In New Jersey the tenants increased from nearly a fourth to nearly one-third of the whole. In New York the loss of owning farmers was 26,534 and the gain of tenant farmers was 12,108. For Pennsylvania these figures were 11,290 and 9,222 respectively."

I am going to treat that subject carefully when it is reached.

Mr. Horr: Question from E. D. Stark, Cleveland, Ohio: "Had our money unit remained on silver, would or could prices, as made in United States standard money, have so fallen as they have since 1873? Simply your opinion, yes or no."

How do you undertake to make me answer questions to suit you? (Laughter.) Just ask questions,—it is more respectful,—and let me take my method of answering them. In the first place you assume, "had the unit

remained on silver," as if that was the only unit we had. I have already tried to show that that was not the only one. But I say squarely, prices could have fallen since 1873 if the unit had remained double just as they have, and the prices to-day, if we had remained that way, would either be in silver money that is not worth as much or would be the same as now.

Mr. Harvey: Question from S. A. Robinson, of New York: "Is not the assumption that there can be an unlimited demand for money to exchange or measure commodities, which are necessarily limited, a self-evident contradiction?"

Mr. Robinson has probably misconstrued my statement that when the mints are open to the unlimited coinage of these two metals there is an unlimited demand for these two metals for monetary purposes. The supply being limited, as we know precious metals are, an unlimited demand for them at so much to constitute a dollar makes a demand that the supply cannot fill. We could absorb three times the amount of money we have in this country now and be the more prosperous for it (applause), and when the mints are open to unlimited coinage it means unlimited demand, so there is no such thing as 371¼ grains of silver being worth less than a dollar when the mints will coin it into a dollar. That is what I mean by unlimited demand and short supply fixing the price because it makes it money at the time. The property is limited that you measure into money, so are the products of these metals that you coin into money. That is as near as I can answer directly Mr. Robinson's question.

Mr. Horr: Question from J. S. Painter, of Chicago: "If it is true, as you have alleged, that the demonetization of silver was accomplished in the most open manner, after a full, fair and protracted discussion of the

subject, why did Kelley, Blaine, Grant and other distinguished statesmen afterward disclaim any knowledge of the purposes of the bill at the time of its passage?"

Why, I suppose they disclaimed it because they did not recollect anything about it. Because a man doesn't recollect a thing does not prove that another man does not remember it. And the difficulty of this whole system of my friend Harvey's is this: He assumes that because certain men don't recollect about it now, nobody remembers about it—I beg pardon for using your name, Mr. Harvey—

Mr. Harvey: That's all right.

Mr. Horr (continuing): This man assumed the same thing. The difficulty is Grant, Blaine, Kelley and you may name a hundred other men, all of them may have been members of Congress, and all of them may say they don't remember anything about it now,—that wouldn't disprove in any way the fact that the bill was openly discussed, that the men on the committee knew about it at the time and that they did nothing of a secret nature. In courts we never try to disprove a matter by showing that somebody doesn't recollect it; it is never taken as proof against a man who does recollect it.

Mr. Harvey: Question by Henry F. Thomas, of Allegan, Michigan: "Can two metals be the unit of value at the same time, any more than two different measures of length or weight? If you answer yes, explain why all nations use a single standard in settling balances. If you answer no, state what metal you recommend for the ultimate standard."

The answer to that question is this: No two metals are used out of which to make the unit in scientific bimetallism. When we discuss silver as having constituted the unit you get an erroneous impression if you

think we are silver monometallists by that. There is a necessity for fixing the unit in your coinage system that regulates your other coins and you can only make that of one metal, so that there is only one yardstick, only one weight, in your system. Now here is where the double standard comes in. You give at the same time unlimited coinage, full legal-tender money power and all the rights of primary money to the other metal that you have measured in the unit made, say, of silver, so that our statute in 1792 read a ten-dollar gold piece shall be of the value of ten dollars, the dollar having been fixed in silver. You have the mints open to the unlimited coinage of both metals, and both as full money, so they form together what you call a double standard,—for what? For measuring the value of property. And when we say that gold and silver together constituted a double standard we mean that these two metals did that, linked together in that way. Gold was measured in silver, both were coined into primary money, and property measured its value in both metals. They were linked together virtually as one metal, and for two hundred years, as you will see by that table I have distributed, which is as far back as we have the history of commercial ratios, the two were virtually one mass of metal, so that you paid in either, and if one became a little dearer the demand went to the cheaper, because the people then used the cheaper, and the fluctuation of a little might do that and shift the demand and bring back the parity, and the two together made the double standard. Now the reason the nations settled balances in one metal: That is not true except since 1873; nearly all the nations—China, India, Mexico, South America and the United States—have almost, if not wholly, settled in silver.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SIXTH DAY. PRIMARY AND CREDIT MONEY. THE MEASURES OF VALUE.

On Tuesday, July 23, at 1 P. M., the debating hall was well filled, while the committee had been obliged to refuse part of the increasing number of applications for tickets. Rev. T. DeWitt Talmage, of New York, was in the audience. Judges Miller and Vincent were on the platform.

Mr. Harvey: The debate at the last session is of value in this:

1. That during the thirty or forty years prior to 1873 silver was seeking the mints to be coined into silver dollars, and that any contrary statement is not true. The two million dollars and more that thus were coined at the mints in the two years immediately preceding demonetization, were for circulation in Nevada and California, where they had refused to use the paper money in their circulation, and were using gold and silver.

2. That by the table copied from the Official Reports from Washington, for about two hundred years prior to 1873, the commercial ratio between gold and silver was at the legal ratio of 15½ to 1, fixed by France during the period that ratio existed, and with the legal ratio that was fixed prior to that, and that there was no difference between the legal ratio and the commercial ratio in that two hundred years except the cost of ex-

change, and that for the twenty-two years since 1873 the legal ratio and the commercial ratio, as we claim by reason of demonetization, have separated rapidly and gone from practically $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 to 32 to 1.

3. That by the table represented in kilograms taken from the same Official Reports from Washington, the quantity ratio in the world between silver and gold for the three hundred and twenty-eight years prior to 1873 ranged from 56 of silver to 1 of gold to 4 of silver to 1 of gold, and that during all that time and during those fluctuations the commercial ratio hung tenaciously to the legal ratio, the quantity ratio seemingly in no way affecting the legal ratio or commercial ratio.

4. That by the table of prices of silver as measured in gold in London from 1833 to 1894 we see that the price of silver there as measured in gold up to 1873 was practically steady, cost of exchange being sufficient to account for the slight fluctuation; but that since 1873 silver in the London market as measured in gold has rapidly declined from 60 pence per ounce to $28\frac{3}{4}$ pence per ounce.

5. That this violent fluctuation and depression of silver has only come since 1873.

Why the London market of silver is taken in gold in quoting the price of silver is this: England went to the gold standard in 1816, and since then London has become the market of the world. In 1844 the Peel act of England required the Bank of England to pay a certain stipulated price for every ounce of gold; there free coinage to gold was fixed in that way, so that, growing out of their gold standard and the Peel act of 1844, exchanges being drawn on London from all portions of the world, gradually a custom grew up meaning gold when you spoke of exchange, until it finally became a

habit among our bankers in the United States to say things are worth so much in gold. It was the dominating influence of London and England on the financial world that caused the custom to arise of speaking of gold prices.

SOME OF COIN'S ERRORS.

Mr. Horr: Gentlemen: On yesterday Mr. Harvey stated that I had found but one error in the statements in his book, and he defied me to call attention to any other mistake that he had made. The mistakes that are made in Mr. Harvey's book are, many of them, not mistakes as to the words that he uses, but misleading inferences from positions which he takes, and which he, giving him credit for the ordinary sense of an ordinary man, must have known when he printed and published such statements. I will now in my opening remarks call some attention to what I mean. In your book, Mr. Harvey, you say:

"It is estimated by all men of judgment who have given practical attention to mining, that the silver now in existence has cost not less than $2.00 per ounce, and many put it much higher."

You will find that in "Coin s" book, page 74. I deny that men of judgment and experience claim any such thing. I assert that every man of any common sense who has studied this question knows instantly that that statement is not true; knows instantly that silver has not cost that much for production, because silver has been constantly increasing in production at a low price, running from $1.20 an ounce down to 57 cents an ounce, and the people of the world never keep constantly producing an article at so much less than it costs them to produce it. Business men are not such idiots as that. According to this statement the silver-mine owners and

men engaged in producing silver lost in the year 1892 $54,000,000. They increased their product in 1893 so that they lost that year $73,000,000. Again in '94 the increase was so large that they lost $109,-000,000, a total loss in three years of $236,000,000. Now, there is an old rule somewhere that "a burnt child dreads the fire." I think there is some truth in that, and whenever silver mining gets so that the men lose at the rate of almost eighty million dollars a year, they will stop silver mining. I don't have to argue that. Every man with a grain of sense knows it.

Again, Mr. Harvey says on page 39 of his book: "There is in the world now, according to the report of the director of our mint, $3,727,018,869 in gold and $3,820,-571,346 in silver."

The mint director didn't give that as the amount of silver and gold in the world at all. The director of the mint gave simply the amount of coin supposed to be then in existence. Mulhall, whom you refer to as good authority, gives the stock of gold coin and bullion in 1890 as six thousand million dollars, and the amount of silver at about six thousand million dollars. ("Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics," page 309.)

"Coin" tells us on page 53: "We have in the United States in round figures $1,600,000,000 of all kinds of money." The statistical abstract of the United States, page 30, says: "The total amount is $2,420,000,000." That gives one amount, you give another. You tell us, page 53, "We are paying England two hundred million dollars annually in gold in the payment of interest on our bonds, national and private bonds owned by her people." Who says that, Harvey? I deny it, and defy any proof that will show that we owe all the countries of Europe combined that much—that is, the bonds that

would require that much of interest to be sent abroad. I defy him to prove anything of the kind. You state that the indebtedness of the United States is forty thousand million dollars, that is, that the people of this country, if that be true, owe nearly two-thirds as much as all the property in the United States is worth. I brand such a statement simply as false. I don't say that Mr. Harvey don't believe it, because it is impossible for me to tell what a man in his state of mind may believe (laughter), but I say the fact is contrary to his statement.

MR. HARVEY: When we reach the cost of production of silver I think I will make Mr. Horr feel like the ordinary eastern man who has spent $100,000 in western silver mining and taken about $250 out, and will satisfy him about the cost of production. (Laughter.)

When he refers to the amount of gold and silver in the world he omits to say that my statistics gave the amount of gold and silver available for use as money. The quantity for use as money is the subject we are interested in. It will do him no good to jump around in "Coin's Financial School" from one end to the other of it, before we get through. He is not going to distract me from the regular line of the debate. (Applause.)

WORLD'S PRODUCTION OF GOLD AND SILVER.

I now distribute among you a table showing the world's production of silver and gold from 1792 to 1892, taken from page 103 of the book last referred to, the "Official Coinage Laws and Statistics" issued by the Treasury Department at Washington, and I pass the book to Mr. Horr.

I now make the table* a part of my remarks.

*The table, shown on the following page, is copied from the U. S. Senate Report No. 235, page 103, Coinage Laws of United States, 1792 to 1894.

Calendar Years.	Gold.	Silver (coining value).
1792–1800	$ 106,407,000	$ 328,860,000
1801–1810	118,152,000	371,677,000
1811–1820	76,063,000	224,786,000
1821–1830	94,479,000	191,444,000
1831–1840	134,841,000	247,930,000
1841–1848	291,144,000	259,520,000
1849	37,000,000	39,000,000
1850	44,450,000	39,000,000
1851	67,600,000	40,000,000
1852	132,750,000	40,600,000
1853	155,450,000	40,600,000
1854	127,450,000	40,600,000
1855	135,075,000	40,600,000
1856	147,600,000	40,650,000
1857	133,275,000	40,650,000
1858	124,650,000	40,650,000
1859	124,850,000	40,750,000
1860	119,250,000	40,800,000
1861	113,800,000	44,700,000
1862	107,750,000	45,200,000
1863	106,950,000	49,200,000
1864	113,000,000	51,700,000
1865	120,200,000	51,950,000
1866	121,100,000	50,750,000
1867	104,025,000	54,225,000
1868	109,025,000	50,225,000
1869	106,225,000	47,500,000
1870	106,850,000	51,575,000
1871	107,000,000	61,050,000
1872	99,600,000	65,250,000
1873	96,200,000	81,800,000
1874	90,750,000	71,500,000
1875	97,500,000	80,500,000
1876	103,700,000	87,600,000
1877	114,000,000	81,000,000
1878	119,000,000	95,000,000
1879	109,000,000	96,000,000
1880	106,500,000	96,700,000
1881	103,000,000	102,000,000
1882	102,000,000	111,800,000
1883	95,400,000	115,300,000
1884	101,700,000	105,500,000
1885	108,400,000	118,500,000
1886	106,000,000	120,600,000
1887	105,775,000	124,281,000
1888	110,197,000	140,706,000
1889	123,489,000	162,159,000
1890	118,849,000	172,235,000
1891	126,184,000	186,447,000
1892	138,860,000	196,459,000
Total	5,663,216,000	5,077,529,000

Here we see that from 1792 to 1800 there was $3.25 in silver produced to $1 in gold, or a quantity ratio—ounce for ounce—of about fifty of silver to one ounce of gold. And yet there was no fluctuation of the commercial with the legal ratio. For the first fifty years of this century there was produced in the world $1.78 of silver to one of gold—a quantity ratio of about twenty-eight ounces of silver to one ounce of gold. The world is now producing about $1.10 in silver to $1 in gold.

In 1873, when the mints were closed, the world was producing about eighty cents in silver to $1 in gold. In 1853 the world was producing about $1 in silver to $4 in gold, four times as much gold as silver.

For 328 years prior to 1873, as far back as we have statistics that are undisputed, that all writers agree on as substantially correct, the changes in the quantity of relative production had no effect on their relative commercial value. But in twenty-two years demonetization has revolutionized the metallic currency of the world.

And there is no longer a par of exchange between the two metals at the legal ratio, which ratio is now only retained to govern the coinage of silver into token money to represent gold.

They assign no other reason than over-production for the break in the commercial parity of the two metals. If they assign any other reason Mr. Horr will surely state it, for the gold standard now has a chance to lay its claims before the intelligence of the country.

I began by defining scientific bimetallism, and in the second clause of its definition I emphasize the importance of the unit. As that has already been discussed, it is not necessary to add anything to what has been said.

LEGAL TENDER MONEY.

Both should be legal tender, in the payment of all debts. This assists in maintaining the equality of the two metals. You interfere with the unlimited demand for their use as money when you limit their full use as money. Excepting in the unit, there should be no discrimination between the two metals as they stand before the law. The right to make a contract to be liquidated in any specific property should not apply to money. All such contracts, when made payable in money, should call for "lawful money." What is good for one citizen is good for another. To permit a raid to be made upon either gold or silver is to permit individuals or combinations of men to dictate to the government what should be legal-tender money. Making money is an act of sovereignty for the common good, and to allow it to be corrupted would be to permit that which would defeat the object intended. The government is the creator of money, and the creator should regulate that which it creates. (Applause.)

As we have seen by the Constitution, only the government can coin money and regulate the value thereof. It is a right inherent in its creation to protect the value of that which has been created, in order that its value may continue to be regulated as fixed. And one of the most important steps is to give to the citizen the right to pay his debts and taxes in either form of coin that the government has created as primary money. No one should have a right to place a limitation upon the right of any citizen to exercise this right. (Applause.) To make debts payable in one to the exclusion of the other, is to make a greater demand for the one and to discredit the other; it is giving the individual a right to promote his selfish interests at the expense

of the common good, to interfere with that which the law creates for the benefit of society. (Applause.)

CAN THE GOVERNMENT CHANGE VALUES?

MR. HORR: I will now proceed, notwithstanding I am charged with jumping around in discussing this book, to point out some of its errors. The difficulty about discussing this book in a systematic order arises from the fact that there is no system in it, and it would be utterly impossible for anybody to devise a system out of such a hodge-podge as that book contains.

While discussing your visionary "law of unlimited demand for silver by free coinage," on pages 47 and 48 of your book, you make Mr. John R. Walsh, whom you represent as present in your school which never existed, ask "How can the government, by passing a law, add a cent to the commercial value of any commodity?" You answer:

"'Suppose,' said Coin, 'that Congress should pass a law to-morrow authorizing the purchase by the government of 100,000 horses, cavalry horses of certain sizes and qualities; and the government entered the market to get these horses. Horses would advance in value. Not only the kind of horses desired, but also other horses upon which there would be a demand to take the place of horses sold to the government.' The hand-clapping that followed this reply, and smiles on many faces, indicated two things: one was, that the reply was satisfactory, the other that the School was making progress, for it was the first applause Coin had received." (Laughter.)

It was the first time Harvey had plucked up courage to cheer himself,—it was an important stage in those proceedings, surely. You would not have supposed from what I have seen of Harvey's followers that he would have been so terribly—

A voice in the audience: Modest.

Mr. Horr: (continuing)—fearful of cheering too much.

"The government," continued Harvey, "can create a demand for a commodity."

Now that answer has misled thousands of honest and unthinking people. My friend here, Dr. Robinson, says "it is using the truth to lie with, which is the most crafty and dangerous kind of false statement." You used this illustration to teach that free coinage would create an unlimited demand for silver and increase its value in the markets of the world. The horses would be bought, kept, and used by the government; and the price of them would be paid to those who sold them, in money. Under such coinage as you advocate silver would be received by the government, coined, and then, in effect, returned to the owner again. He might not get the dollars made from the identical silver which he took to the mint, but he would get those coined from silver received and treated precisely as his was, so that he would practically get back the same thing. The only honest connection possible between your illustration and the truth would depend upon the government's branding each horse and returning him, or another horse of the same class which had been treated and branded in the same way, to the man who presented the horse for branding. Now, what influence would that have on the price of horses? It would not increase the consumption nor would it affect the supply. That horse business is a fraud on its face, that's all. (Applause.)

PRICES OF WHEAT AND CORN.

Another item: You say that the average price of wheat, as given on page 108 of "Coin's School," aver-

aged 85 cents in 1891. The Statistical Abstract gives the New York price $1.09 in 1891, and the average price in Chicago in 1891 was 97 cents. If you are teaching the people the truth, explain this discrepancy.

Again: The statement that the corn crop of Illinois controlled the market price of corn in 1873,—you so state on page 116 of "Coin's School." Now, the corn crop of Illinois in that year was 217,000,000 bushels; the corn crop of the United States was 1,092,000,000 bushels that same year. In 1893 you state that the corn crop of Illinois was 160,000,000 bushels, which you teach to the people governed the price of corn in the United States that year, whereas the product of corn that year in the United States was 1,619,000,000 bushels. Now, what I want is, Brother Harvey, that you should tell us how that little tail in the Illinois corn crop wagged the whole dog in the United States. (Applause.)

In another portion of your book you state, at least by implication, that the farmer's products will not buy as much of all kinds of commodities, except labor, as in 1873. You do this on pages 121 and 122 of Coin's School. That statement is misleading and untrue. The farmers' products taken as a whole will buy as many things that the farmers need and use as the same products, all taken together, would have bought in 1873, and I shall make that plain before this debate is finished. I will not go on to the other topic until my next time.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr will make nothing by abusing or ridiculing me; the intelligence of the American people demands something higher than that. (Applause.) If Mr. Horr will utilize his time in answering me when I give the official history of bimetallism and the relative ratios, quantity, commercial and legal, that is now being spread upon the pages of this debate from the

official documents at Washington, he would be serving a better purpose in this debate than by trying to divert it. When he called your attention to the illustration in the "School" of the government entering the market for horses,—which speaks for itself in the book and needs no defense,—Mr. Horr should have thought of how the government fixes the price on gold. You take a certain quantity of gold to the United States mint, and it is coined and given back to you in so much money. The price of gold as money is fixed. Now we ask the same thing for silver, that's all (applause), and we believe this government can become more prosperous and more easily kept out of the hands of pawnbrokers of the world, with two metals for money than it can with one.

When we get to the wheat table in the fifth chapter of "Coin's Financial School" I will satisfy Mr. Horr that it is right, as he has already been satisfied of everything that we have touched. (Laughter and applause.)

THE OPTION OF THE DEBTOR.

Now I proceed with the argument of what is scientific bimetallism. An important branch of it is the option that we have of paying in either metal. So important is the question of the impartial treatment of the two metals in respect to legal-tender that it has always been regarded as one of the most important essentials in bimetallism. The option of the debtor to pay in either metal is a vital principle. Unlimited free coinage at the mints guarantees substantial parity. But if, by reason of short supply, a corner on one of the metals, or from any other reason, one of the metals is enhanced in value, the debtor exercises his option to pay in the other metal, and this transfers the demand

from the dearer metal to the cheaper metal. A break in the commercial parity causes the cheaper metal to be used. This increases the demand for the cheaper metal. This increased demand restores the value of the metal that has thus fallen below a parity and brings it back to parity. To give the option to the creditor causes the dearer metal to be demanded, and it thus grows dearer and dearer, and a parity is permanently broken, and the gap grows wider and wider. When the debtor has the option the two metals will oscillate close to a parity and substantially at a parity. This oscillation is the elasticity that bimetallism gives to primary money. If one becomes scarce the other is used. If one is cornered the other takes its place. Either answers for money. This option in the debtor regulates the demand.

With silver discarded as it is now we must go to the men who own the gold to get it and submit to their terms. A corner on beef cannot seriously threaten the health of the people of this nation so long as mutton and pork are in competition with beef. A corner on gold could not, as it does now, seriously threaten the credit of this nation if silver were in competition with gold as primary money. (Applause.) If we used the $300,000,000 of silver now in the Treasury, there would be no borrowing of gold. When both are money on equal terms, one is in competition with the other. This shifts the demand from the dearer and scarcer to the cheaper and more abundant and holds them at a parity. This proposition has been demonstrated to you by the tables that are already printed in this debate. Supply and demand make values, and the law of bimetallism regulates the demand and holds the two dollars, silver and gold, at an equal value. Bimetallism has

the same principle as in the construction of a balance wheel of a watch. It is made of two metals, and under heat or cold as one of these metals contracts the other expands, and the effect is the regular action of the wheel. In 1873 we made our financial balance wheel out of one metal.

Authorities are as numerous on this, the debtor's option, as on the subject of the unit. I shall satisfy myself by reading from *The Chicago Tribune* of January 14, 1878. It says, editorially: "Hamilton and Jefferson concurred in the wisdom and necessity of having a double standard, the purpose being to confer the option on the debtor to pay in either metal at his pleasure. Those great statesmen clearly foresaw the trouble and disaster that a single standard would bring upon the country. The retention of the option by the debtor to pay in either silver or gold is vitally important to the welfare of the whole American people and must never be surrendered." (Applause.)

I quote this because I know there are many people who, while not agreeing with me, will agree with *The Chicago Tribune*. (Applause.)

PRINCIPLES OF BIMETALLISM.

These are the principles upon which bimetallism is constructed. Thus joined together, silver and gold were in effect one metal. Like two legs joined to one body, they obeyed a common will, that put forward first the one and then the other. The will they obeyed was the law of supply and demand. Thus civilization strode down through the ages, ever growing and increasing as the aggregate supply of the two metals increased. Its greatest growth came with the phenomenal increase beginning in 1849, and by 1873 had adjusted itself to this

increased supply. The body and limbs had grown with the new supply of blood. All nature is bimetallic. We have two legs, two arms, two eyes, two ears: one relieves the strain upon the other.

It is not necessary in this debate to give statistics for the relative quantity of the two metals now in existence in the world available for use as money. It was conceded until Mr. Horr made a statement a few minutes ago that they were both equal at about $4,000,000,000. He does not deny now that they are equal, but he puts it at about $6,000,000,000. I will settle that at a future session. An equal quantity of either, dollar for dollar in quantity, by weight, sixteen ounces of silver to one ounce of gold. Both are in the world to-day in existence available for use as money.

Mr. Horr: My friend Harvey insists on conducting this debate without permitting me to refer to anything he has said in the previous part of the debate unless it comes in order, according to his idea of order in his book. It is easy to see why he does that. He has a portfolio filled with written essays, worked out by him or somebody, I don't know who (laughter), which he proposes to read in his order. I came to the city of Chicago without a syllable having been written and supposing that this was to be a sort of stand-up fight, and every word I read is called out by the statements that he makes here on the discussion. It may be annoying to him, I am sorry if it is (laughter), but I am running this business to please myself. (Laughter.)

Mr. Harvey: That is right.

Mr. Horr: I am not laboring very hard to please you. (Laughter.)

INCREASE OF FARM TENANCY EXPLAINED.

Yesterday, Brother Harvey called attention to the

great increase of farm tenancy in the United States since 1860. It is one of the points that he makes in his book that the country is going to the dogs, because there are more people that work land as tenants than he likes to see. He objects to their doing it. He tells us that it is a sign of national ruin. It is from his point of view, but not from mine. Now let us see why he calls this increase evil and I call it good.

The Minnesota Bureau of Labor, in 1893, investigated the condition of all the farmers in eleven typical townships. It thus obtained reports from 1,798 farmers, of whom 1,555 were farm owners and 243 were tenants. Of the farm owners, 235, or a number equal to that of the tenants, once were tenants, and most of them once worked for wages. Only two of those tenants had ever lost a farm by mortgage foreclosure and only seventeen of them had ever been farm-owners. Of the 235 owners, once tenants, the average of four years had sufficed them to pass through tenancy to farm ownership. This rising from the position of farm tenancy to farm ownership is something that pleases me—it doesn't please Brother Harvey. But tenancy in all parts of the United States means just the same as it does in Minnesota, and hence Brother Harvey objects to that tenancy in Georgia and Massachusetts the same as in Minnesota.

Now take the United States census. The men and women in 1880 working for wages on farms was 3,225,876; in 1890 their number was only 3,004,015; in 1880 the farms worked by tenants were 1,024,601; in 1890 they were 1,294,913; in 1880 the farms worked by their owners were 2,984,306; and in 1890, 3,269,728. The persons working their own farms now—see how completely this accords with my ideas—the persons working their own farms increased 285,422, while those who

were tenants increased only 270,312, and those working for wages instead of increasing in number actually decreased 219,761, while the population of the nation increased twelve and a half million. Now I like these changes. Mr. Harvey says he does not. I like to see men improve their condition in life. I say it is a good thing. Mr. Harvey doesn't seem to agree with me. He sees in tenancy, as it is in the United States, the rising of men by the hundreds of thousands, from a low to a high condition, a national calamity. Is it? I do not so regard it. I was once a farm hand myself. I was only too glad to get ahead so that I was afterward able to work a farm as tenant, and then I was just as glad when I later was able to manage and own a farm of my own. And after that I left the farm and it is to-day being worked by a tenant. But the man who is working it as tenant was once a day laborer, and I think he is better off by working as he does, and I know I am doing better than I did when I was farming.

And now he seems to think that it shows a bad condition of society to have men come from one class into another. See here, Brother Harvey, if you would show the people of the United States that this increase in tenancy had been at the expense of farm-owners you would have made a point, but that is not the truth. Undoubtedly in Massachusetts men have left their lands in the hands of tenants, but they have gone to the West. They make up the best people in the great Western country; persons who have graduated from the farms of New England and helped to build up this great country of ours in the West. They are the sinews of this nation.

Is it possible that in order to show that this country

is almost a hell on earth, you must undertake to prevent the natural growth of man from a lower condition to a higher? Your philosophy compels you to do that. Mine is the other way. (Applause.)

Mr. Harvey: The rules governing this debate are that we are to discuss "Coin's Financial School" in its order, and that is exactly what I am doing. That Mr. Horr does not find himself prepared to discuss it in that way is no reason why I should follow him in all the somersaults that he makes.

Now the reader may think it strange that I do not stop and answer him about this tenant business, but I promise you that when I have reached its logical place in the order of the debate, I will attend to it, and attend to it right. And I promise that Mr. Horr's statement that he has just made will not only appear plainly unfair and not consistent with the facts, but one which, when properly considered, is a part of the history of our hard times. He had no right by the rules of this debate to go to that subject now. A simple question yesterday put to me at the end of the debate brought that subject up in an answer. Its logical place in the debate is elsewhere.

I now proceed with the discussion as logically arranged by the rules.

PRIMARY AND CREDIT MONEY.

There are two kinds of money, in the general sense in which we use the word money. One is primary money,—to use the expression "money" only, would be more proper,—the other is representative money. The latter is something that represents real money. For the purposes of this argument, I will sometimes refer to representative money as "credit money." Credit

money is of two kinds. One is paper money and the other is token money, both representing real money. Token money is used because of the uses to which it is put. This use would quickly wear out paper money. Thus copper cents have always with us been token money, and nickel five-cent pieces also, since they came into use. No attempt is made to maintain the commercial parity of these metals at any ratio with the metal out of which primary money is made. They simply represent real money, and are redeemable in real money.

They are used for convenience to represent primary money. We use token money to pay for articles the price of which is less than values at which we coin primary money. Primary money is the measure of values.

GOLD THE MEASURE OF VALUE.

Now Mr. Horr wanted me to take up that subject when he was discussing that verse from the Bible in the fly-leaves. I now reach it at the place where it is discussed in the book. Gold (our present primary money) is now the measure of values. Mr. Horr has told you that that is a fact. He and I agree. Silver and gold working together, as before explained, virtually as one metal, was formerly the measure of values. What is meant by measure of values is, that the price you receive for a commodity you take to the market is governed by the supply and demand of the other commodity from which real money is made. Let me illustrate this first by an exchange of property.

Suppose a man goes to market with a hogshead of tobacco to exchange it for wheat. When he reaches the market the quantity of wheat he will get for his tobacco

depends on two things: first, the supply of tobacco and the demand for it; secondly, the supply of wheat and the demand for it. If wheat is plentiful, and the demand for it is normal, the man will receive in exchange for his tobacco more wheat than he would receive if wheat is scarce and the demand for it strong. If wheat is scarce he will receive less wheat for his tobacco than he will in the first instance where wheat is plentiful.

So, money being made from a certain substance, when the man goes to the market with his tobacco to exchange it for money, the quantity of money he will get depends on the supply of this substance from which money is made, and the demand for it. If the supply of the money substance is large and the demand for it light, he will get more of it for his tobacco than if the money substance is scarce and the demand for it great.

The quantity of gold now in the world, available for money, as we shall see later when we reach the fifth chapter of the "School," is in bulk the size of a cube twenty-two feet. Now suppose a mountain of solid gold was suddenly discovered that was the cube of a mile—that is, a mile high, a mile wide and a mile long—and after this discovery you went into the market to exchange your tobacco for money (gold being the substance from which money is made), you would get in exchange for your tobacco a much larger quantity of money than you do now. The—say 3 cents a pound—you get for it now represents its exchange value with gold, and the six cents a pound you once got for the same grade of tobacco represented its exchange value with money when silver and gold both were used as real money. (Applause.) The trouble with most men in understanding the effect of money on prices, is, that they are confused with so many forms of money, and

do not understand the relative nature of real money with credit or representative money.

When we have gold as real money, as we have now, our representative money is tied to it as the tail of a kite is fastened to a kite. It goes up and down with gold as the tail of a kite goes up and down with the kite. We make it as good as gold only by fastening it to gold. Hence we now hear of a fifty-cent silver dollar. Why? Because silver is being measured in gold, and so is all your property. We have fifty-cent wheat and five-cent cotton, and this relative decline is the same with all other property where its value is measured in the gold markets of the world, not affected by trust causes or a new use that has increased its demand. What reduced the prices was taking away one-half the real money. What will put it back is to restore that half of the money. Silver is now used as token money, representing gold.

Bear in mind one thing through this whole argument—that supply and demand regulate the value of money, the same as of all other property. This the people already know. They only need to be reminded of it.

THE ASSESSMENT OF CHICAGO BANKERS.

Mr. Horr: Before proceeding to the discussion of the question of the production of silver I want to complete what I was trying to show to the American people: the unfair (and if it was not for Brother Harvey himself, so good-natured, I should be inclined to say the purposely misleading) nature of his statements in his works on finance—in his "Coin Up To Date" on page 19. He there endeavors to make the people of this country believe that the banks and the bankers are swindling the people and do not list their money for taxation. He makes the broad statement that—

"The assessor's books of this county for this year show that the credits of all the banks in this city, which means all the notes, bonds, mortgages and other securities and collaterals, are assessed at $10,000. In this, the largest city in the country, with its tens of millions of securities held by its banks, that is what they are assessed for."

Now there may be some method by which he can prove that, strictly worded, what he said is true, but the common, ordinary reader would be led to believe something that is widely from the truth. I have not had time, Mr. Harvey, to see how much out of the way you are, but I find right here from the books of the treasurer in one district of the three in this city, the assessed valuation in that one district of the banks (and I have here the names of each) was $8,289,143.20. And those very institutions, which he tells us paid on only $10,000 to the city, paid in this one district $535,-161 in taxes.

Now what I object to is not that you cannot by some hook or crook prove that, worded as you worded it, the statement may be true, and you may get a certificate from the assessor's books that it is true. What I object to is that you purposely mislead the people of this country as to the amount of taxes levied and paid on the banking institutions of this city, in order to smirch bankers and business men of this city where you live.

THE REASON FOR THE GOLD STANDARD.

I now proceed to take up the question as to why the people of the civilized world refuse to adopt Mr. Harvey's plan. I admit that the nations that first demonetized silver did so because they considered the mineral unstable, variable in price, and that afterward the element of cheapness came in, the nations which acted

later did it because silver was cheapening all the time and because they found that the reasons given by the nations that had acted earlier on this subject were good ones. They also resorted to a gold standard.

Now it matters not, so far as this debate is concerned, what all the nations of the world altogether might do with silver, Mr. Harvey. In your book and yesterday in every statement you made you used the term that if "the mints of the world" would give free and unlimited coinage to silver on a certain ratio, it could be maintained. I have not denied that. That is not the question we are discussing. I do not know what all the civilized nations of the world if they combined could do. I know they have not done that and they don't propose to do it now, and the question we are discussing is, after the entire civilized world has refused to use silver as money of final redemption and still refuses to use it, can the United States single-handed and alone afford to put itself upon a silver basis and join Mexico, China and Tripoli on this subject. That is the question we are debating. Is not that the question we are debating? Mr. Harvey will not claim that the discussion here includes anything as to what the whole world might do. I have always stated that I hoped some day the business men of the world would get together and agree upon some standard, taking into account the increasing production of and necessary fall in the price of silver, and fix upon some business plan whereby we could use both metals as the money of redemption. But for this nation to start out single-handed and attempt a thing of that kind would be financial ruin to the people of this country (applause), and it is against that which I protest. Now I have a table taken from Coin's book, which I purpose to publish, Mr. Harvey,

the product of silver since 1874 as far as you go; I have added to it from the mint reports the product of 1893 and 1894. I shall put this table in my remarks and make it a part of my talk.

PRODUCTION OF GOLD AND SILVER IN THE WORLD, 1873—1894.

Calendar Year.	Gold.	Silver (coining value).
1874	$ 90,750,000	$ 71,500,000
1875	97,500,000	80,500,000
1876	103,700,000	87,600,000
1877	114,000,000	81,000,000
1878	119,000,000	95,000,000
1879	109,000,000	96,000,000
1880	106,500,000	96,700,000
1881	103,000,000	92,000,000
1882	102,000,000	111,800,000
1883	95,000,000	115,300,000
1884	101,700,000	105,500,000
1885	108,400,000	118,500,000
1886	106,000,000	120,600,000
1887	105,775,000	124,281,000
1888	110,197,000	140,706,000
1889	123,489,000	162,159,000
1890	113,150,000	172,235,000
1891	120,519,000	186,733,000
1892	130,817,000	196,605,000
1893	157,238,000	209,165,000
1894	181,510,000	214,381,000

Now this table shows—and the table that he exhibited to you and exhibited around shows the same as far as it goes—that since 1874 the production of silver has been constantly on the increase. Gold since 1875 has been constantly increasing in quantity too,—but gold has increased since 1873 from $90,750,000 worth in one

year to $181,510,000,—just about double. Silver in those same years has increased from $71,500,000 up to $214,381,000. While gold increased only twice, silver has increased just about three times.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr began the last time by getting clear out of the book we are discussing and brought into this discussion another book I have written. Now why does he do that? If he will only stay in the harness with me in this debate where I can get at him, and at the same time devote the words at my disposal to the subject we have agreed to debate, it seems to me it would be more proper. (Applause.) His fondness for protecting national bankers probably lured him out of the book we are debating. (Applause.) I say now that I refuse to discuss anything outside of "Coin's Financial School" that is not appropriate to the subject under discussion, but will add that all of you who will write a letter to David Gore, Auditor, Springfield, Illinois, will get the confirmation of what Mr. Horr attacked in "Up to Date." (Applause.) When I reach it I will follow Mr. Horr closely and drive him from every position that he is taking in its proper order.

I was discussing the relation of primary and credit money, and had called your attention to the fact that supply and demand regulated the value of gold, out of which our primary money is now made, the same as supply and demand regulate the value of all property, and you only needed to have your attention called to that.

The lesson for you to learn is that primary money, now gold, gives to its representative credit money the same purchasing power that it has itself. Mr. Horr has learned this lesson. He says on page 64 of his debate with Senator Stewart,—Mr. Horr has the book of that debate now with him,—"The circulating medium

of the United States is to-day based upon gold, its value is fixed by the value of gold." Mr. Horr is right, and our currency is fixed by the value of gold. The question is often asked, "Is our silver redeemable in gold?" The government has by its different credit acts fixed this, and therein confirmed what was originally intended, namely, to establish the gold standard. So all our forms of money have their value fixed by gold, and on this Mr. Horr and I agree, if I understand Mr. Horr.

MR. HORR: That is right.

CREDIT MONEY DOES NOT AFFECT VALUES.

MR. HARVEY: He says that is right. To illustrate this, in the "School" I used wheat certificates and said that these certificates issued against the wheat in Chicago elevators did not increase the exchangeable value of wheat with other property. The certificates represent the wheat and facilitate business, but do not give any additional value to wheat. In fact, the price of wheat is now lower than it was before the use of wheat certificates was introduced. Neither does paper and token money, representing gold, affect the value of gold or property, except in the sense of facilitating exchange. They are each a medium of exchange, but not a measure of values. Primary money fixes the sea level of prices.

There was no paper money in circulation in California between 1849 and 1873, and very little between 1873 and 1880. When visiting California as late as 1884 I found gold and silver to be at least two-thirds of the money in use. It is hard for one accustomed to paper money to understand this unless he has been in a country where no paper money is used. In California gold and silver were carried in the people's pockets. A \$20, a \$10, two \$5's in gold and \$5 in silver was not regarded

as inconvenient, and the remainder of their money, in gold and silver, was deposited in banks. And yet between these years, gold and silver prices were as high in California as they were with us. Paper money circulating with us did not take away from silver and gold prior to 1873, or from gold since then, any of its exchangeable value, nor did it add any to coin prices with us as compared with prices in California where there was no paper money. Mexico has no paper money (see article "Romero, Mexican Minister," in June number, *North American Review*), and yet wheat is worth there $1.30 per bushel in silver—the equivalent of our gold price for wheat here where we have paper money representing gold. And corn in Mexico is worth $1.50 per bushel—more than its relative value here in gold, where we have credit money to re-enforce gold, and Mexico has no credit money to re-enforce its silver.

When the law makes a certain metal the measure of values, as it now does gold, or two metals in concurrent coinage the measure of values, it is a mistaken idea that paper or tokens, issued to represent this money, increase or decrease their exchangeable value, except in the sense that they may facilitate the exchange. Mr. Horr says in the *Weekly New York Tribune* of June 19 (the paper is here, Mr. Horr), "Paper money is worth only the value of the money in which it is redeemed." And Mr. Horr is right. I do not mean to say that paper money cannot be made primary money, as we may see later, but it does not become the measure of values when only representing primary money. To be a measure of value it must represent itself only.

Any one who denies the proposition that primary or real money alone is the measure of values is asked to consider this: With relative production of silver to

gold since 1873, not accounting for the decline in silver since that year, why is it that silver is worth only fifty cents now, as compared with one hundred cents in 1873? And, if a change of our money measure to the gold standard has reduced the price of silver 50 per cent, what reason is there that it would not exert a similar influence on other property? For 2,000 years silver and gold have gone together, locked arm in arm, and now suddenly while gold stands erect silver falls on its knees with its head resting on the hip of gold. Does not the same hand that thus humbles silver strike at the prices of all other property? The reader is now asked, before he reads further, to turn forward to page 348, and look again at Mr. Sauerbeck's table giving the relative decline of property with silver since 1873.

WHY SILVER IS CHEAPER.

Mr. Horr: Any business man will only need to look at the table of production of silver and gold since 1873 to be able to ascertain that the law which I partially illustrated yesterday operates in reference to silver as well as in reference to every other commodity. Silver does not represent to-day the same amount of labor, of work, that it represented in 1873. It is cheaper because the demand and the supply are in such relations to each other that it makes it cheaper just as wheat has been cheaper, and for the same reason.

Mr. Harvey is mistaken. Prices are not governed or controlled by the amount of primary money in any country or in the whole world so far as I know. No political writer of any distinction ever claimed anything of the kind. I know in the book he refers to—in my debate with Mr. Stewart—he admitted in so many words that the price of articles is affected by the entire circulating medium of the coun-

try. I shall show you before I get through that such a rule is, of necessity, the right one. Why, when we passed the law of 1873 there was at that time only about one hundred and thirty-five millions of gold in the country,—all the primary money we had. If his doctrine is true prices should have been doubled instantly. Ah, but here is the trouble with your mathematics. If your doctrine is true every product in this country should have been reduced in price by this cheapening of silver.

MR. HARVEY: Silver is not now primary money.

MR. HORR: Silver is not primary money; and under his doctrine, because primary money has been reduced in that way one-half, all prices should be reduced one-half. Have they been? Has corn depreciated that way? Has pork depreciated that way? Have cattle depreciated that way? Over one-half the farm products of the United States are as high now as they were in 1873, a fact which could not be true if his doctrine as to the appreciation of the measure of value is true. Prices would necessarily be split in two, reduced one-half. Now the difficulty is, articles are cheapened by the processes of production. What is value? Where do we get the idea from?

PRICES ARE FIXED BY COST OF PRODUCTION.

As I stated yesterday, it is fixed by the amount of human toil which enters into the production of an article. Now don't misunderstand me, I don't say the price of an article will be just the price of the human labor that enters into it. No, no, that isn't the rule. The price of an article is always fixed by the absolute cost of production to the concern producing it, which does it at the highest price at which it can stay in the

business after the price is fixed. You will understand me, because I will illustrate it so that you will get at what I mean. It isn't a question that a little boy like "Coin" could understand, perhaps, but it is a question that thinking men will see in a moment. Whenever you make an invention, an improvement, so that by machinery you cheapen the cost of production, the price of the article will go down to the lowest point that it can possibly get toward this new cost of production, but always stops with the highest cost to the men who stay in the business of producing.

For instance, we had been paying years ago a dollar a pound, and a good deal more, for aluminum. It used to cost that in actual work in expense to get a pound of it. Now aluminum is without limit in the crust of the earth almost. Scientific men tell us that it composes perhaps one-tenth of the entire crust of the earth. Every clay bed is from 20 to 70 per cent aluminum. Every shale rock is loaded down with it, and the trouble has been to reduce it into the form of a metal so that it could be utilized by the human race. It used to cost so much that it was worth a good deal more than silver.

DR. ROBINSON: More than gold.

MR. HORR: Yes, more than gold. Now we have been cheapening the production of aluminum by discovering means of separating it and getting it into metal form,—pure metal. Every invention that we have made has cheapened the production until now it is down to perhaps 40 or 45 cents a pound. Now listen,—I believe that there are men in this house who will yet live to see aluminum so cheap that it will be used in casing our houses, and will take the place of lumber when it shall disappear from use in house-building.

Each generation takes care of itself, and generally

succeeds in getting something better than the generation before it. Now mark,—when some person shall make an invention—and it will be done—shall discover a method of reducing aluminum so that it can be made for ten cents a pound, so that that is all it will cost, the price of aluminum will not go down to ten cents a pound at first, or anywhere near it. The man making the discovery will hold the price as high as he can keep it, and that is always at the highest point that it costs any of the men who still stay in the business to make it, and the balance he puts in his pocket as profit. And that is the law of prices the world over. After a while they will drive out the most expensive man in the business. He will have to stop, and the price will go down to the next lower, and they will keep reducing the price in that way. But the cost of production after all is the great element that fixes the price of any article, gold and silver, or anything else, and any one who endeavors to impose upon the people, attempting by law to drive them to use any article for more than its actual value, will fail. (Applause.) You can't do business on that plan in this world of ours.

Mr. Harvey: I hope in the course of the next debate, to get through with the logical presentation of this question and then have it out with Mr. Horr right here on all these questions that he is now bringing up, and I am only going to refer briefly to what he has said now.

He speaks of improved facilities and improved cheapness of production as lowering prices. Now, when we meet on that I know exactly how a reasonable man is going to decide it, but I just give you this to think about in the mean time, so you won't be following Mr. Horr off on his sidetracks.

Between 1850 and 1873 we had a great era of im-

proved facilities. Even the harvesters were all invented and in use before 1873, even the binder, and yet prices were rising. Improved facilities increased constantly, and at the same time prices were rising. When we get to it we will all understand this question.

The people of the United States are being deceived, most wofully deceived, on this money question, and the owners of money, gold and money payable in gold, and bonds and securities payable in gold, are running a corner on you by which they are becoming owners of you. (Applause.) You are being sold in bondage to the pawnbrokers of Europe to-day by this monetary policy. (Applause.) And before I get through with Mr. Horr none of these specious arguments and specious styles of reasoning of his will be in our way. We shall brush them all to one side so that an intelligent man can understand himself and be deceived by none of them. In the mean time remember this, that when you say price, you mean dollars; that the price of a thing is its value measured in dollars, and that that now means gold dollars, and when Mr. Horr tells you that silver can be produced twice as cheap now as it could in 1873, and that is the reason why it is only worth fifty cents, put this question back to him in your minds: "Cannot gold be produced now for one-half what it cost in 1873, if you are right, Mr. Horr?" (Applause.) "If 371¼ grains of silver is now only worth fifty cents why is not the quantity of gold in the gold dollar only worth fifty cents, if you are right about your cheap cost of production?" (Applause.) The reason why the gold in the gold dollar is worth a dollar is because the government stamps and makes it a dollar. The reason why the silver in a silver dollar is only worth fifty cents is because you are not measuring it in itself—it is no dol-

lar, it is a token, and you are measuring it by the gold dollar that is the measure of value. (Applause.)

SILVER IS NOW TOKEN MONEY.

I was discussing primary money as a measure of value. We have as much silver relatively with gold in our monetary system now as we have had at any time in forty years, but it is not performing the functions of primary or redemption money—it is token money—resting on gold, and silver bullion is measured in gold. When we say price we mean gold. Silver is not exerting an influence as a measure of values. The act of 1873 made by express words the unit of value of gold, and left gold without any concurrent coinage of another metal to add to its quantity. Hence it left gold the sole measure of values, and such it is.

In determining whether primary money or primary and credit money combined are the measure of values I want you to think of this: That in 1867—I read from the Statistical Abstract of 1894, page 278—in 1867 all the money in circulation was per capita $18.28. At that time all money was primary money, the measure of values was paper money itself. In 1872 the money in circulation was $18.19 per capita, and all of it was primary money. We were pricing everything in paper money, and bought gold and silver when we wanted it. Now come to the time when we have the redemption system in vogue. We find that in 1894 we had a per capita circulation of primary and credit money combined of $24.23, more money per capita in 1894 than in 1867 or 1872. Now you will say that the quantity of money in circulation affects prices. You have more money, primary and credit combined, in circulation in 1894, per capita, than you had in the two

years named previous to 1873, and yet the prices were higher then than now. Why? Because there was more primary money per capita in circulation at the two first named years than there is in the last named year, 1894.

Of the $24 per capita in circulation of all money in 1894, only about six dollars is primary money, while in 1867 and 1872 there was $18 per capita primary money in circulation.

Mr. Horr: I am very much surprised to hear my friend say that we were getting along well during the years of suspension of specie payment when we used entirely money that on its face had to be redeemed. His definition of primary money was money of redemption. Every greenback has to be redeemed to make it good. It is not primary money, nor we cannot construe it into primary money by any hook or crook. Now, in 1879, we did return to specie payment, we did make our greenbacks and all our money as good as the best, and Brother Harvey and his whole crowd of followers and adherents were going up and down this country stating that if we undertook to enforce that act we would ruin the business of this country. I know they said it because I heard them dozens and dozens of times. They believed it just as Harvey does now.

Mr. Harvey: You did not hear me say it.

Mr. Horr: Well, if you were old enough you did say it. A man constituted as you are couldn't have said anything else. Your whole crowd kept repeating it. I did not hear you say it because I didn't hear you talk, but if I had been near enough to have been within sound of your voice I would have heard just the same words exactly from you. I am familiar, not with him, but with his history on that business. We were told this same thing, that the whole business hung on the amount per capita of money in circulation.

Now I want to say to Mr. Harvey right here, I have not admitted that prices are governed entirely, or anything like it, by the amount of money in circulation. I said that your authorities who claimed that "quantity" doctrine all admitted (all of them, so far as I know, admit) that it is the quantity of anything that is used as a circulating medium that affects prices. I did not say I adopted the theory, because my experience has proved to me that a country is prosperous, not in proportion to the amount of stuff that circulates and is called money, but to the amount of honest money, of honest money that will be redeemed when presented in its value dollar for dollar. (Applause.)

This country was never more prosperous than from 1879, as I told you yesterday, up to 1892. There is not a man living who can take the statistics and prove that we were not doing well as a nation during all those years.

Now, Brother Harvey opens every speech he makes by announcing what wonders he is going to do before this debate closes. He is going to drive me into the corner; he is going to maul me all over the house; he proposes to bury me out of sight; he is such a fearful fellow that he is going to sweep like a cyclone over this whole country with that terrible intellect of his. Why, I am here yet, and I notify you, Brother Harvey, I will be here when we get through. (Laughter and applause.) And another thing I want to call your attention to. What the world has lost, hasn't it, because there have been no Harveys up to the present time! (Laughter.) What a darkness the whole world has been in! The "stuff" I am preaching, if he calls it such, is believed in by a great majority of the thinking men of the United States. It is believed in by the best men in

Great Britain. The financiers of France have adopted it. It is well understood that it is firmly rooted in the conviction of the German students. Switzerland believes in it. Every civilized nation on the face of the earth believes in it, and they have adopted it deliberately.

CIVILIZATION IN SILVER COUNTRIES.

Who are your followers, Harvey? The men of China—what financiers they must be, what a civilization they have developed, haven't they, with their silver theories? There isn't enough of them to withstand that little patch, Japan, which has recently knocked the stuffing out of them. (Laughter.) Now you know that Mexico believes it. Are you proud of Mexican civilization? Do you know anything about it? Do you want to reduce this country to the condition of the miserable poor Mexican peons, who are just a little bit above the grade of our Southern slaves? What nation have you that knows anything and believes as you do, Harvey? Japan is recently looking toward a gold standard; she is getting her eyes open and she drifts in the way of common sense. The only South American nation that claims much civilization is Chili, and she is just adopting the gold standard.

Is it that the philosophers and sages of the civilized world are all ignoramuses and that we can get no wisdom except we look for it in this crowd of populists—I cannot use the proper words that would express my feelings without being disrespectful to my hearers, whom I love dearly, you know.

When you come to the opinion of intelligent and of thinking men, to-day, as they did in the past, they agree with me upon this question, and I propose as we

go on in this debate to show to my friend Harvey and to the people of this country that all he is trying to do is to destroy the values of this country and trying to put this nation upon a level with the uncivilized nations of the world, and he is trying to reduce the pay of men who labor, in an indirect manner, by cutting down the value of the dollar which they receive for their work, and I do not boast of being able to hold him down to any kind of business. I am too old to think that is possible for anybody to do, you know, but I will show the American people that his whole philosophy would work ruin to the best interests of this nation, and when I have done that the people of this country will never adopt the nonsense he teaches. (Applause.)

MR. HARVEY: When I said the automatic binder was invented before 1873, I meant to say the automatic hay rake.

Mr. Horr says I am a greenbacker. Now, Mr. Horr, there is nothing in anything I have ever written or anything that I have ever said that will justify you in saying that I do not believe in gold and silver as primary money to the fullest extent under the bimetallic laws that governed it prior to 1873. (Applause.) We may later discuss greenbacks and their proper position in our financial system.

Mr. Horr failing, I presume, to find better arguments, undertakes to sustain his case by saying that gold has been adopted by all civilized countries as the sole measure of value, and that we have on our side only Mexico, China, Japan, and such nations. Now, Mr. Horr, that is not argument. When national legislators are tricked into adopting laws, and it has been secured by such means, to turn around and use that argument will act as an irritant on the people.

I want to call your attention to another fact,—that we had slavery once in all civilized nations (applause); and the slaveholder made the same argument that you have made here to-day. (Applause.) I want to remind you of another thing: that Rome rose to a high state of civilization,—they did not have everything that we now have, but they had many things that we have not now,—and when she was at that great height of civilization her strength was her farmers; the yeomanry of the Roman Empire was prosperous and was out of debt, and there was a high state of civilization. No one can tell but that they were then possibly within one hundred years of a new era, that would have opened up things yet undiscovered, when the mailed hand of selfishness was laid upon the Roman Empire. It was the money-lenders of Rome and Athens (applause), and in a short period they had so manipulated the money of that empire, the measure of values by which those honest and unsuspecting people contracted debts in one measure and had to pay them in a dearer measure, that they ruined that great civilization which is commemorated to-day by the Italian hand-organ. (Applause.)

That we have risen to a high state of civilization does not mean that this change in our monetary system is right; it is the beginning of a decline in civilization, and has been forced upon us to pander to the selfishness of the men who understood that legislation would be in their personal interest when they fostered it. (Applause.)

THE PROPER FUNCTIONS OF CREDIT MONEY.

I now proceed with the question of the relation of primary and credit money. Credit money represents

primary money. If a bank issues it, it is expected to redeem it in primary money; if the government issues it, it is expected in like manner to redeem it. It is not value, but represents value. It is issued on the same principle that a check is issued.

Credit money may be issued by the government with safety only in such quantity as will not embarrass it in case a run is made on the government for redemption. If it is a government well founded and popular with its own people it may issue credit money to an equal amount with the quantity of primary money in its border. If redemption money is required, it can float bonds among its people to the full amount, if necessary, and get the primary money. It should never borrow money from the people of another nation. (Applause.) To do so is a sure indication of monetary weakness (applause), and if persisted in will lead to bankruptcy. No man can do business on borrowed capital over a long period without the almost certain risk of failure. The same is true of a nation if it borrows from a foreign nation. No harmful effect results necessarily from a nation borrowing from its own people. When a nation, its municipalities, its corporations and its people are all borrowers from another nation, their decay has set in (applause), and nothing but exceptional statesmanship and vigorous action can save it from financial revolution and resulting disaster. (Applause.)

Hence a government should not issue credit money in quantity beyond the amount of primary money among its people. As to itself, it should have no money in its treasury except for its current expenses and improvements. The money should be among the people. (Applause.)

We thus see that money, primarily, is a commodity, property, a thing of value, possessing an exchange value with all other property; that credit money is a title to primary money, and this title can be stamped on metal or on paper; and that this credit money should not be issued to an amount greater than the primary money available for its redemption. I want to prove this by Mr. Horr in *The New York Tribune* of December 30, 1892. He says—instead of reading it I will pass the paper to Mr. Horr and state that what he says in it confirms what I have just said, and if it does not Mr. Horr can check me up.

QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE.

This ended the debate for the day, and questions were then read from the audience.

MR. HARVEY: This question asked me is by H. L. Bliss, of Chicago. "You quote Sauerbeck's prices from 1873. Why do you fail to give prices prior to that date? Is it to conceal the fact of an abnormal increase of prices from 1870 to 1873, and that the subsequent fall was but a return to normal conditions? Here is Sauerbeck's full table."

I will say for the benefit of Mr. Bliss that I have Sauerbeck's tables here and will give him one of them, and had not reached the place where I wanted to introduce it in this debate, and at the time I referred to it I directed the stenographer to say, "hereafter to be introduced in the debate." That was so that the reader at the time I referred to it would understand that it had not yet been introduced. I am going to make the Sauerbeck table a great educator in this debate.

MR. HORR: Question from A. C. Babcock, Chicago. "Mr. Horr, you stated yesterday, 'The real measure of

values is human toil.' Must not every measure be based upon a definite unit? Please define the unit and state how your present toil is worth several times more in gold than the toil of the ordinary workmen as you have stated." (Laughter.)

The real measure of value is human toil, human effort. We have to fix some unit of measure in some definite substance, and we always should fix a unit that represents as near as we can the same measure, one day in and one day out, as nearly as possible. "Please define the unit?" I can't do it, except by saying that the great financiers in the civilized nations of the world have fixed upon gold as being the best one that human ingenuity can devise. I agree with these philosophers rather than those who differ from them. Just why my present toil is worth several times more in gold than the toil of the ordinary workingman would be egotistical for me to state. (Laughter and applause.) You may just as well ask me why Joseph Choate can get more in a lawsuit than Brother Harvey. I could answer it, but I wouldn't (laughter), because I would have to be personal. (Laughter.) And the man who asks this question of me undertakes to make me explain a thing that I am too diffident to undertake. (Laughter.)

Mr. Harvey: Question by A. H. Nelson, Helena, Mont. "In opening the debate on Saturday last you said: 'The debate so far is of value in this: it shows first that gold and silver is the money of the constitution.' Please tell us where the constitution, either by express declaration or by necessary implication, determines what shall be money in the United States? Does the exclusive right 'to borrow money' or 'to coin money' determine of what money shall be made, or

does the word 'tender' in section 10 of the constitution have the same meaning as 'money' in section 8?"

The answer is that gold and silver are the money of the constitution because the states reserved in the constitution the right to gold and silver as money, and when the inhibition was laid on the states to make nothing but gold and silver legal-tender money you had no right to take away from those states one of those metals as a full legal-tender money. (Applause.) When you destroy silver as full legal-tender money, with all primary money rights, and make a token out of it to represent gold, you have destroyed one of those metals mentioned in the constitution. Webster and all statesmen who lived and expressed themselves at a time when the constitution was fresh in their minds, and the men who framed the law under it, all declared gold and silver as the money of the constitution.

MR. HORR: Question from E. D. Stark, of Cleveland, Ohio: "If free coinage of silver had been continued, would prices of commodities have fallen as they have? If your answer be yes, do you not confess that silver would have the same stability as gold? if your answer be no, do you not confess demonetization has caused the fall of prices?"

My answer is that if the coinage of silver had been continued in this country when the rest of the civilized world refused its free coinage, then this nation would have been compelled to do its business on a silver standard, and that the prices of commodities when named in dollars might not have fallen any, but the actual value of the articles would have been substantially the same as the value is to-day. By answering in that way he wants to know, "If you answer 'yes' do you not confess demonetization has caused the fall

of prices?" Certainly not. I confess nothing of the kind. The difficulty with Mr. Stark is the same difficulty that my amiable friend is troubled with. (Turning to Mr. Harvey.) (Groan from the audience.) There is another man has got it bad. (Laughter.) You don't distinguish the value of a thing expressed in one kind of dollars when expressed in another kind. A dollar may be in one country worth fifty cents, in another country worth one hundred cents. When you use the term "dollar" you may state the price twice as high in one country where the dollar is worth only fifty cents and only half as high in another country where the dollar is worth one hundred cents. The actual value will be identical in both countries.

Mr. Harvey: This question is asked by Dr. S. A. Robinson of New York: "Why is it that for the twenty-one years previous to 1873 there was an average balance of trade against the United States of more than $68,000,000 annually, and that for the twenty-one years following 1873 there was an average balance of trade in our favor of more than $100,000,000 annually?" (See Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 73.)

The answer is this: For that portion of the twenty-one years previous to 1861, the beginning of the war, our tariff schedules were so adjusted as to encourage importation, and we wore the manufactured articles, largely, of Europe. The low tariff made our imports exceed our exports, and that made the balance of trade against us, that is, we sent more money abroad than we got in return. During the war we were great consumers of our products and we consumed mostly what we raised ourselves, therefore our exports were small. Immediately following the war we became a very thrifty people. With immigration rapidly swelling westward

and the building of all our great railroads we became great absorbers ourselves; with the erection of manufactories we absorbed our own products largely. Now following 1873 our exports were larger than our imports, first caused by the high tariff stopping imports, while exports grew, as we had an abundance over what we absorbed ourselves.

We ceased to absorb all that we produced and it began to go abroad and the tariff laws encouraged that condition. That continued and was encouraged by the fact that we had enormous money balances to settle with Europe, and we were forced to sell our property in Europe to settle those balances; hence our wheat and cotton and other property, including our silver bullion, is thrown upon the market in London to settle those balances, and still we do not have enough to settle them. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: This question comes to me from George H. Shibley of Chicago: "You stated yesterday, 'The real measure of values is human toil.' Do those who claim this apply it as a measure of exchange value for deferred payments; that is, a measure of exchange values at different periods of time with the benefits of improvements intervening, a question of distribution of improvements?"

I stated, I supposed perfectly clearly, that originally they fixed the measure of value by hitting upon something that represented a certain amount of human labor, and from that day to this that element had always been retained in the unit of value, or always should be so, that it might be able to produce an exchange of labor for labor at all times. In fixing a substance for the payment of deferred debts, those debts must be paid, if honestly, in the measure of values existing at the

time that the debt was contracted, both borrower and lender should always use the same measure. What I said in regard to the payment of debts (if I said anything, and if I did not say anything on that subject, I will now), is this: The majority of debts in this country are not over three months old; the debts that run only ninety days are the great mass of the debts paid in every civilized nation. Debts that run over a year are much smaller in number, while the debts that run over five years are still very much smaller, and the long-time debts are always made and owed by wealthy people, large corporations that issue long-time documents for the purpose of getting their money for a low rate of interest.

The debts of the United States to-day almost entirely have been made with the gold standard, and they honestly should be paid in the same kind of money as that in which they were made. (Applause.) As to whether that is true or not will appear as we go on in this debate.

The debate was adjourned to Thursday, July 25, at 1 P. M.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SEVENTH DAY. RELATION OF PRIMARY AND CREDIT MONEY. THE COST OF PRODUCING GOLD AND SILVER RESPECTIVELY.

PROMPTLY at 1 P. M., July 25, the debaters entered the hall. The demand for tickets of admittance had been increasing steadily, so that many had necessarily been denied, while every seat was taken and interested listeners stood in the aisles.

MR. HORR: I desire at the outset to call my opponent's attention to a statement which he made in his criticisms upon Senator Morrill, wherein he stated that the silver dollar of 412½ grains was largely coined previous to the demonetization of silver and after the passage of the law of 1853 which made subsidiary coins of less value than their face, and he thereby drew the inference that Senator Morrill was mistaken as to the coinage of the 412½-grain silver dollars when he intimated that none of them had been coined from the silver that was mined in the country. Brother Harvey said that those old dollars of 412½ grains were coined for the people of Nevada, Colorado, and perhaps California, between 1853 and 1873, in his remarks yesterday—

MR. HARVEY: No, I did not say that.

MR. HORR: You said that as I understood you.

MR. HARVEY: I said in '71 and '72 for California and Nevada.

MR. HORR: Well, that is between '53 and '73.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, but does not include those coined from '50 to '61, which were used all over the country.

Mr. Horr: The intimation as I understood it, Mr. Harvey, I don't want to misrepresent you, and the impression made upon me was that those were coined, —contrary to my statement, that they would not have been coined at that time because silver was worth more uncoined than coined,—and that it was done for the use of the people in those western states. Now I have been examining that matter, because I was at a loss to see how it could happen that those men who had silver bullion would at that time have taken it to the mints of the United States and had it coined at its face value; that is, the face value of the coin when they could have sold it for more uncoined than coined. But come to look it up, Brother Harvey, I find that your whole statement, as usual, is incorrect. Those dollars were not coined at any of the western mints, nor were they coined because the people of this country took their silver to the mints for that purpose. You were right, silver was worth more uncoined than coined, and hence its owners would sell it as bullion and would not seek to coin it. Where then did the silver come from that was thus coined? I will show you. Congress had previously provided that certain foreign silver coins should be received at the treasury and the several postoffices and land offices of the government, at a certain fixed valuation. In the second section of the act of February 21, 1857, Congress provided:

"And be it further enacted, that the said coins when so received shall not again be paid out or put into circulation, but shall be recoined at the mint."

And then the director of the mint also tells us that over $5,000,000 of silver had accumulated in the

mints, found in the gold during the process of assaying it. Now, if you had desired to be accurate, as an inspired teacher ought to be, such as Harvey-Coin, you know, you could have learned that the silver dollars which you tried to account for were all coined at the mint in Philadelphia, and not from the silver taken to the mint by our producers at all, nor for the use of any particular state, but in conformity with statute laws of the United States. The silver produced in this country has never been coined for the benefit of bullion owners since 1853. How simple the truth! How difficult it is to establish a theory by a person who never inquires carefully as to his facts!

Mr. Harvey: May I interrupt you, Mr. Horr?

Mr. Horr: Certainly.

Mr. Harvey: You are making this statement on your own *ipse dixit*, and I want you, when you make such statements, to produce the authority.

Mr. Horr: I give my authority as the report of the mints of the United States. And if Brother Harvey had been studying as a student of economics instead of attempting to establish a theory he would have soon found out the facts. The free coinage of silver in the United States was stopped after the law of 1853, which directed all subsidiary coins to be made from silver bought by the government, and the high price of silver at that time prevented the coining of any silver dollars in the United States from silver that was produced by the miners of this country, and confined the coinage of silver to that which was bought by the government, to those foreign silver coins which had accumulated in the treasury under law, and to the accumulation of silver that occurred in the process of separating the gold and silver that was sold to the

United States; and I defy my friend Harvey to show an instance from the report of the entire mints where, after 1853, a dollar of our American product was ever received for free coinage in any mint in the United States.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr has persistently quoted in this debate authorities which he has not produced here in this room. I want that, now, impressed on the mind of the public.

He has just made a statement with reference to the coinage of silver dollars that I deny, and he cannot produce the authority here to prove what he has said. I will only answer it now incidentally, but sufficiently. I hand Mr. Horr the report of the director of the mint for 1892, and call his attention to 412,462 silver dollars coined at the mint at Carson City, Nevada, in the year 1870. (Applause.)

I want to say by way of summary that the high state of civilization to which the first nations of the earth attained was under the use of both gold and silver; that since then the demand for gold for use for money has intensified, and its effect on the prosperity of all these nations is apparent.

Also, that the change from using both gold and silver as money to using gold alone was in no instance brought about by the consent of the people. I want this remembered as this argument proceeds.

I want to emphasize here that I am contending for the use of both metals, and to say that to-day's argument is to show that both are needed.

Mr. Horr's statement, that the book we are discussing is not logically arranged, is not the case. He knows, as more than a million readers know, that the second chapter takes up the history of bimetallism; the third

chapter, the relation of primary and credit money, and the relation of money to credits. He understood the logical arrangement of this debate on the first chapter, but after that he entirely left that arrangement, and it is not my fault that he has seen fit to try to execute all kinds of flank movements.

THE RELATION OF PRIMARY AND CREDIT MONEY.

As at the close of the debate at the last session I was closing with the discussion of the relation of primary and credit money, I will now complete it.

An over-issue of credit money creates a lack of confidence in the ability of the government to redeem it, and a strain on its primary money begins.

In other words, it causes a run on the government for the redemption of its credit money. This forces the government to issue bonds to borrow primary money. It does not want paper or token money, but must have primary money. This strain continues as long as the over-issue of credit money remains. To borrow primary money, and pay it out again, does not stop the pressure unless the quantity of credit money has in the mean time been reduced to its normal quantity, or unless the quantity of primary money in the nation is increased.

So long as this unhealthy relative proportion of credit money to primary money continues, the run on the treasury will continue and the borrowing by the government must continue. And the more it borrows, the greater the strain, as the interest on bonds demanded in primary money will be an additional strain. This is what Mr. Cleveland calls "an endless chain, taking gold out of the treasury."

If, at a period like the present, when gold only is by law primary money, we increase the stock of credit

money by issuing more paper money, or by coining more silver as credit money (the way in which it is now treated), we increase the strain on gold, and hasten the financial chaos that must come. That is illustrated by the fact that banks all over the country are paying out silver certificates, and thus owners of money retain the most desirable for them to make a run on the treasury for gold. With all these silver certificates to get gold paid it requires a little circumlocution. I have a letter on the table here from a large manufacturer in New York State, received within the last few days, in which he says that all the money the bank sends him to pay off his men is in silver certificates.

The quantity of gold now in the United States is variously estimated at from $400,000,000 to $600,000,000. The quantity of credit money outstanding is about $1,000,000,000. Hence a surplus of from $400,000,000 to $600,000,000 of credit money is now in circulation, and the run on the United States Treasury must continue till the credit money is reduced to the quantity of gold in the country, or the stock of primary money is increased. (Applause.)

Hence, we see that in all financial systems, primary money and our credit system are intimately connected and that our credit system begins with credit money. The next step in our credit system is individual credits, including checks, drafts, bonds, mortgages, accounts and other forms of indebtedness, all resting on what is our actual money—primary money.

To bring order out of confusion, we want to go to work at once to build up our stock of primary money. To do this, the first step is to remonetize silver and make it with gold, as under the old laws, substantially one mass of metal constituting our primary money.

When we come to the discussion of the last chapter of the "School," we will see how this will in no way prevent holders of gold obligations getting their gold, while the country will return to a prosperous condition.

Under the financial derangement we are now going through, the country must suffer as a patient with chills and fever. The demand on gold will rise and fall as the markets for gold alternately loosen and tighten.

Prices of property will rise and fall accordingly, but ever with a tendency downward. Like the progress of a fatal disease, the impulses of nature at intervals resuscitate the patient and hold out a deceptive promise of improvement.

Each time a government gold loan is made, with, say, the Rothschilds behind the treasury, temporary confidence will be restored and prices will advance. The government supplying itself with gold causes the gold-hoarders in the United States to let their gold out. But as the yellow sand in the hourglass at Washington runs out again, as it must, a scare returns, gold-hoarding begins again, the demand for gold increases, and prices correspondingly fall. The end is national bankruptcy. To correct this system is national prosperity. Every moment's delay endangers the safety of the republic. (Applause.)

If I am wrong as to primary money being the measure of values, then you will all agree with me that it is the total volume of money, that it is a deranged monetary system, that tries to hold the quantity of credit money at a disproportionate volume to that of primary money, and that this cannot be done. Hence, as all credit money rests on primary money, if we adhere to the gold standard we must look to gold alone to sustain it.

SILVER DOLLARS COINED IN NEVADA.

Mr. Horr: I wish the stenographer before she leaves would tell me the amount of silver dollars Mr. Harvey stated had been coined in 1870 at the mint at Carson City.

The Reporter: Four hundred and twelve thousand, four hundred and sixty-two.

Mr. Harvey (Stepping up to Mr. Horr and taking the book): I see that in the uncertain light of this room I mistook the dollar mark for the figure "4." I will state that the number of silver dollars coined at Carson City, Nevada, in the year 1870, was 12,462. Correct it in your notes. (To stenographer.)

Mr. Horr: No, I want it put down just as it occurred. My friend Harvey seems to think that because I make a statement that I have taken from the mints of the United States, and because I don't lug in the books, and then with a good deal of show say, "I now pass this book over to Mr. Harvey," that therefore I don't make my statements correctly. He has furnished a book here which proves exactly my statement. His mistake—I am very sorry he made it, because if he had read carefully he would not have made the criticisms on my statement at all—

Mr. Harvey: Excuse me, that is the object in passing the books to each other, so if one of us makes a mistake inadvertently, the other can correct it.

Mr. Horr: If I make a mistake he has the chance to go right and bring me up as I have him this morning. Now this mint report which he handed me shows that after 1870 up to 1874, in the entire mint at Carson City there were only coined 19,288 of the old silver dollars. The mint report will show that those were coined from the silver accumulated in assaying the gold taken to

that mint. My proposition was that not any of the silver produced in the country and sold by silver owners, or taken to the mint for coinage, was embraced in that money which he says was coined after 1853. I have made it plain. Now this report shows that there were over 4,000,000 trade dollars coined in that mint after 1873, but I was talking of the coinage of the standard silver dollars and accounting for their being coined when the silver in them was worth more as bullion than as coin. Now I submit to Brother Harvey that all his statement on that subject is simply incorrect and his own report here shows that my statement is true.

THIS COUNTRY CANNOT RESTORE THE RATIO.

I now proceed to state that up to this moment Mr. Harvey has not said one word upon the real question in debate. He spent hours to prove that the law of 1873 was "conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity." I gave a short, succinct history of the origin of the bill and the steps taken in its passage. He has not successfully controverted a single statement of mine. He has nowhere proven any act of bribery or the influence of money in a single step taken during the progress of that bill through Congress. He or no one else ever will, because there was none. He has now printed long tables to prove that when the entire world, except England, was attempting to control the price of silver by legislation, they succeeded in keeping the legal price within five cents on the dollar of the market or commercial price, and that generally the variation between the market price and the legal price was only about two points.

I have shown—and he virtually admits, at least

he has nowhere denied it—that a variation of one-quarter of one point has thus far been sufficient to drive the dearer metal from every country in the world. But suppose we admit that by the concerted action of these countries, including all Europe, except England, they did prevent, with the conditions that existed in those days, a variation of no more than two points between the legal and commercial ratio, that does not help Mr. Harvey in this debate in the least. That does not tend to show that the United States Government alone, with the entire civilized world refusing free coinage to silver, and when the difference between the commercial ratio and the legal ratio is 16 points, can restore the old ratio; it proves precisely the opposite of what he claims. It proves that if the combined action of the civilized world, except Great Britain, with the half-civilized nations, all that have the silver standard and working to help them, could not maintain a parity between the legal and commercial ratios when the production of gold and silver were nearly the same,—that now, when the production of silver has increased twice as fast as that of gold, it is folly to claim that one nation alone can restore that old ratio. Mr. Harvey admits as much when he provides for cutting down the size of the gold dollar. With all his assurance he has not had the hardihood to claim that the United States alone can restore the old ratio. He ought to know—I am satisfied he does know—that nothing of that kind would occur. I think he does not desire to have any such thing occur. I think he does not desire to drive the purchasing power of the silver dollar up. He says, reduce the size of the gold dollar,—tells us that the gold dollar has been constantly advancing in price, and that

the silver dollar has remained stationary. He says over and over again that an ounce of silver will exchange for as much of human productions to-day as it ever would. We will see about that as we go on. Now, my proposition is that gold has remained nearly stationary in price since 1873 and that silver has fallen in price in accordance with the great law of supply and demand, and that the cheapened processes of production, with the increase of the supply, has driven down the price of silver.

MR. HARVEY: I am going to ask Mr. Horr a question before I proceed. The table on production of silver for the world shows the world's production in 1860 to have been $40,800,000, and that the production increased each year till 1872, twelve years later, when it was $65,250,000. Here was an increase of 64 per cent in twelve years in the production of silver. Now if you are right why did not this increase break down the price of silver from 1860 to 1873? And before you answer I call your attention to the twelve years, 1872 to 1884, when the increase is 63 per cent, 1 per cent less than the previous twelve years, during which time the price of silver had fallen 17 per cent. Do you want to answer it now, Mr. Horr?

MR. HORR: No, I will think over it, don't crowd me now.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr challenged me to show where any dollars were coined outside of the Philadelphia mint. I did that. Now I want to say to Mr. Horr, while disputing all that he has said, the silver derived from gold in refining gold at the mints was not coined into dollars, but was coined into fractional silver. When he says that the government was willing to lose that 2 or 3 per cent premium he is saying that the gov-

ernment was willing to do something that the individual was not. That is what he contends for. I want to make that thing plain. Suppose a man in Nevada had a lot of silver bullion and wanted it coined in those years into silver coin. Now 2 or 3 per cent premium for silver would be no inducement to that man to ship that bullion to London,—that is where this premium was; it wasn't here nor in New York. The freight and insurance and expressage would more than consume that 2 or 3 per cent, not to speak of being out of the use of his money in the mean time. Hence he would take it to the United States mint and have it coined into money that he could use immediately. (Applause.) The premium on silver, so called, as measured in gold prior to 1873 was only the difference in cost of exchange at London with the French ratios. And if you will study the tables that have been produced here in the history of the metal you will find that is true. Now I will proceed where I left off.

HOW MUCH PRIMARY MONEY IS NEEDED?

We have thus far considered what primary money should be made of and its relation to credits. It is important in the study of money to inquire into the quantity necessary to transact the business of the country. How much money does the aggregate business of the country demand? We have seen that there is not to exceed $600,000,000 of primary money (gold) in this country, and $1,600,000,000 in circulation of primary and credit money combined. If this was properly proportioned—credit to primary money—would it be enough?

It is in effect admitted by the other side that it is not, but they say bank credit with the check system

supplies the balance. The "Coinage Laws and Appendix" we have been using, pages 215 and 240—I now hand the book to Mr. Horr—show that the total deposits of the people in the United States at a certain day in 1893 in banks of all kinds, were $4,848,862,680. This is in the face of the fact that there is only $1,600,000,000 of money of all kinds in circulation; and it, as we know, is not all deposited in the banks. This leaves at least $3,300,000,000, more money subject to check than there is of our whole stock of money. The surplus is what is known as bank credit and check system. It also indicates what is a normal amount of money for the transaction of the business of the country. Give it your impartial judgment, and you cannot escape the conclusion that the $4,800,000,000 approximates the quantity necessary. You cannot say that it is in existence, for it is not. You cannot say that it is the capital of the business men, on which they are transacting the business of the country. You can only say that experience teaches that so much is necessary. You cannot say that it exists. It represents the amount of cash capital necessary for the business of the country, but it is not cash capital. It is one-third money and two-thirds bank credit. There is one-third enough money to furnish capital for and facilitate the business of the country, and the banks, with their credit system, furnish the other two-thirds. On the one-third we pay no interest. It is not interest-bearing money; it is the money of the country. We pay interest on the other two-thirds. To say there is $4,800,000,000 deposited in the banks, is to say at the same time the banks are drawing interest on $3,300,000,000 of it. It works this way:

A deposits $10,000 in bank. B borrows the $10,-

000 from the bank, but does not take the money, it is placed to his credit. Now the $10,000 has swollen to $20,000 on deposit. The $10,000 is still in the bank. C comes in and borrows it, and places it to his credit. Now there is $30,000 on deposit. Interest is being paid on $20,000 of it. A has $10,000 to his credit, the capital in his business, on which he is paying no interest. B and C have each $10,000 to their credit as capital in their business, and they are both paying interest.

This is how we find there is $4,800,000,000 on deposit, with only $1,600,000,000 in the country. It shows that business demands $4,800,000,000. It shows that business is borrowing $3,300,000,000 of it. If it did not need it it would not borrow it and pay interest. The lesson to be learned from this is:

That the country needs $4,800,000,000 to meet the normal demand for money. It needs it just as it needs a normal supply of wheat or anything else. If you want to confirm this, take the loans given on the same pages last referred to, showing that the loans of all banks at that date were $4,769,879,495. With only $1,600,000,000 in the government, they are loaning three times that sum. This money is furnished how? The banks furnish it with the credit system, by which one dollar is made to circulate in place of three that are needed, and the banks collect interest on two of the dollars. For each dollar in existence, we are paying the banks interest on two dollars. This is the way the banks work the actual volume of money in existence up to the normal volume. With $1,600,000,000 in existence, the people are using it and paying interest on $3,300,000,000 additional. This interest varies from 6 to 12 per cent. At six per cent it is a tax of $198,000,000 annually, to support this sytsem in sup-

plying the shortage in our money volume. The banks are interested in holding down the volume of money, and supplying the remainder needed with their system. They take the quantity of money in existence and stretch it like a piece of rubber. And they sometimes let loose of their end. It is used to mold public opinion in their interest. It can be truthfully said that all the money in circulation represents borrowed money. The bankers thus have an influence in molding public opinion. It is human nature known of all men that most debtors are moral cowards. Money is the lash they are afraid of, and money-lenders hold the whip handle. The borrower is the servant of the lender. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: That whole question of whether banks are a curse to the world, and as to the credit of the country being the country's life blood, will come later in this debate. When I reach it in the regular order (laughter and applause), it will be presented to Mr. Harvey's perfect satisfaction. (Laughter and applause.) Indeed I doubt whether he won't leave the room in perfect disgust with himself for having entered into this debate. (Laughter.) I now proceed to the question I was talking about.

DECREASE IN COST OF SILVER.

According to the report of the Senate committee the decrease in the price of 226 leading articles on our farms and in our shops and factories since 1879 is only about 7 per cent. That is no more than the natural decrease in the price of such productions owing to the improvements of machinery, which I spoke to you about, and which should always diminish the price to the consumers of the country. Silver has decreased in price

50 per cent, so have several other articles in the world, influenced by the peculiarities surrounding each article, and consequently not influenced by the unit or measure of value having appreciated. It is all idle talk, Brother Harvey, about silver costing two dollars an ounce. To add to the cost of producing an article all the money that has been lost in mining speculations and gambling is too ridiculous to permit a child, even though his name be "Coin," and though he be "inspired," to announce as an economic proposition. Gamblers are not producers.

The men who manage and operate silver mines will be diverted by such nonsense as that. There are mines in the United States that can produce silver, and save money, at fifteen cents an ounce, large mines that are doing that very thing to-day.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr, that is your individual assertion, for which you have no proof. (Loud applause.)

MR. HORR: I hold in my hand a pamphlet written by M. L. Scudder, who spent a long time in the mines of this country, and obtained from the mine-owners themselves the real cost of producing silver in those mines. He gives the name of the mine, the exact cost of producing the silver per ounce, and the year, taken from the books of the company, and in that there is one mine where the cost was only thirteen and a fraction cents, and he names another where it was twenty-four cents. Now I submit that that is a simple proof of the proposition I stated and undertook to make you understand here previously. Silver mining is like anything else, men do not engage in it as a business for fun, they engage in it for the purpose of profit, of getting ahead in the world, and whenever silver mining costs two dollars an ounce, men who are in it paying their

expenses, and can only sell it for sixty cents, will quit that business, you know. (Applause.) Yes, they will the world over. Men don't conduct a business year in and year out and lose three times as much as they get out of the enterprise every year—I say three times as much as they get out of it. I don't know but Brother Harvey could stand a drain of that kind a good while; but it would swamp me in a very few years to do a business that lost three times as much as I could get out of the concern.

The mines that are mining silver at less than sixty cents will keep right on in the business; they will get the price, as I told you before, of those concerns that can barely live and produce it at sixty cents. They get the highest price at which anybody can produce it and still stay in the business. Now, if silver drops below sixty cents, there are a few mines that have to shut down; the mine that is taking its silver out for fifteen cents an ounce does not shut down, it keeps right on and gets as high a price as it can, and that will be fixed by the highest-cost mine that still produces it and stays in the business. Now, Mr. Harvey, the fact that these mines have been running since 1879, according to your own statement, when the full effects of demonetization took place, with silver going down and down, I say if the production is increased from year to year, that of itself proves, and no man can gainsay it, that they are still making money at the price, or they would not stay in that business—they could not. That is the law of business all over the world. (Applause.) Hence this effort of Brother Harvey is to get $1.29 out of the entire people of the United States for an article that costs the men who are producing it less than sixty cents an ounce. Was there ever such class legislation

attempted in any country, to compel the people to pay for a thing three times as much as it costs to produce it?

No man who knows anything about the laws which govern production will dispute my proposition in this regard. Hence—now listen—hence the men who own mines and those who owe sums of money in excess of the money due them, if they can work the scheme to pay their debts in cheap money, and if those men who own the mines can manage to get three times as much as it costs them for their product, they may be benefited, but the balance of the people of this country will receive nothing but injury from this entire scheme. (Applause.)

COST OF PRODUCING GOLD.

MR. HARVEY: I am going to permit myself to be diverted for a moment. What Mr. Horr has said about the cost of producing silver, he could have said with a great deal more force about the cost of producing gold. (Applause.) Gold and silver are alike in their geological formation, in this, that silver only is found in hard formation, and gold is found in the same hard formation—in quartz veins. In that they are alike. In this they are not: gold is also found in placer mining—and most of it has come from placer mining—and there, gold is produced very cheaply, because it requires no miners' picks nor blasting powder, nor working in hard rock, and no quartz mills are necessary; it is panned out or sluiced out at a very small cost of production. Silver is never produced that way, and gold, dollar for dollar, costs a great deal less than silver does. (Applause.)

Now I am not going to stop with my own *ipse dixit*,

Mr. Horr, I am going to read from Del Mar on the history of money, the book you read from the other day. He says:

"Apart from other considerations there can be but little doubt, that the average cost of producing a pound of silver, from the beginning of the world to the present time, has been far greater than that of producing a pound of gold." (Applause.)

That is by weight, which means that it has cost sixteen times as much to produce silver as it has to produce gold. Now this is the fact, gentlemen, silver and gold where found in quartz formation are mined not only with great difficulty, but with great uncertainty; the precious mines are not even and certain like coal and iron veins—you have got it to-day and lose it to-morrow. You have it in a three-foot vein of rock quartz to-day, and one inch to-morrow; you are a millionaire this hour and poor the next; you are poor one hour and rich the next. Frequently they erect costly machinery and buildings to work a mine, only to find the next shot has blown the mine out, and all that expense goes for nothing. (Applause.) Now, that is precious-metal mining, and Mr. Horr knows it, we all ought to know it, because some of you, if you have not tried it yourselves, have neighbors that have gone out West, and do you know that ninety-nine out of a hundred of them come back with their money lost? (Applause.) Precious metals are not in the earth in even or certain quantities, and the cost of production in the aggregate has been more than the value produced. Now you ask me, "Why then do they continue to produce?" Tell me why men will gamble on the Board of Trade of Chicago, and I will answer you. (Applause.) It is that feverish desire of men to make a fortune suddenly,

and occasionally somebody does it in the precious-metal mining, and that is the reason why they keep at it.

Now, Mr. Horr says that so many ounces of silver have been produced since 1873, year by year, and increasing, and he says if they are not making money out of it why do they continue it. Now that is answered in this: First, a large per cent of that comes out of the production of gold. In the production of the gold,—they are born in the earth together—they are wedded by God Almighty in the earth (cries of "Good! Good!" and applause); and in refining the gold a large percentage of the silver we get is produced—to get one you must get the other. In the next place over fifty per cent of all the silver produced comes from prospects where men are trying to make mines, mines that are not paying in either gold or silver or both, and they are shipping that to get back what they can. (Applause.)

There are three or four silver mines only left in the United States that are paying, and they are running precariously. Why? Because all mines are uneven and uncertain and may be lost in a week from now.

You refer to this man Scudder, you refer to this willing servant of the National Banking Association of the United States who was sent out to Colorado to defame his own country (loud applause), who wrote a pamphlet that was a fraud, wrote it purposely for circulation to injure the cause of silver and the people. (Applause.)

The United States is the largest producer of silver in the world, and our Rocky Mountains are a source of wealth to the nation. To the loyal American, sensitively zealous as to the institutions of his country, it is humiliating to hear men renounce reason, and resort to abuse of their country, to make good an English

argument that should, if there is anything in it, rest upon the soundest logic and the purest Anglo-Saxon common sense. (Applause.)

WHAT BANKERS ARE DOING.

I will direct your attention to where this trouble comes from, and I do it by continuing with the subject that I was on, because I am now traveling with you to the point whence all our troubles have come.

I have nothing against the bankers individually; I have against their system. They are a smooth, polished, well-fed class of citizens, and on any subject that does not threaten their system they are patriotic, intelligent people. They cannot see why they should not loan the same money over and over again until they work the quantity in existence up to the quantity required. To have what money there is play through the banks like a shuttle-cock, weaving their fortunes, is a system they consider worth defending. The Shylocks of old loaned their own money; the Shylocks of to-day have a system by which they loan other people's money. (Applause.) They are defending that system.

They are organized. I read from page 1026 of volume 7, part 2, Congressional Record of February 14, 1878. This was read in the United States Congress from the files of *The New York Tribune*, the corporation which the honorable gentleman is with:

"The capital of the country is organized at last, and we shall see whether Congress will dare to fly in its face."

CHANGES IN PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS.

MR. HORR: I wish to say to the people of this country that on the face of business transactions the statement which Mr. Harvey makes, I do not care who has said

it before him, that it costs as much to get a pound of silver as it does to get a pound of gold, is not true. It has not been true for a great many thousand years. There was a time when the two were worth precisely the same per pound. The same author that he kept quoting from will show you the separation in price from 4 to 1 until it got down where it is now, to 30 to 1. The gap has always been widening and silver has always been getting cheaper. So has gold. I have stated that to you here before. Gold has been cheapening since 1873 when measured by human toil together with the products of human toil. It has been following the same law, but silver has depreciated much faster than gold.

Now, I deny from the start that the depreciation in gold has been anything like what my friend Harvey claims, or that he can prove it, as he attempts to, from the price of articles produced in the world. Their whole effort is aimed toward trying to make the farmers of the United States believe that they have been injured by this legislation. They frankly admit that on the face of it to cut the price of the dollar down with which you pay a man for his every-day work, would injure the man. Consequently they have turned their guns entirely on this agricultural business.

However, the American toilers, the great producing classes of the nation, how have they been affected by the economic changes since 1873? Those toilers may be divided into two great divisions, the agriculturists and the toilers of the city, of the towns; men who live on the products of the soil and get their pay according to the price those products bring, and the men who work for fixed wages and get their pay in money such as is circulating in the country. The effects of those

changes upon the agriculturists may be seen in the average prices received by them for the produce raised on their land. The measure of those results upon the city toilers must be found in the wages they receive for their work. Let us take first the agriculturists. Let us inquire about the average sum received by them for their agricultural produce.

Brother Harvey, in Monday's debate you stated that owing to the resumption of specie payments from 1873 to 1879, the silver legislation of 1873 did not affect prices very much until 1879. To measure the effect of silver legislation then upon the farmer I will compare the value of their crops before and since 1879. I will compare the five years from 1875 to 1879 with the five years from 1890 to 1894.

I will use the home value of the crop, or the value of the same to the farmers, and begin by using material furnished by the agricultural department and summarized in the statistical abstract for all the years excepting the last two years. I will begin with the largest and most important crop of the land, a crop which is worth more to the producers than any other two. I refer to corn. In the five years, 1875-1879, there were raised in the United States an average annual crop of 1,176,715,000 bushels, for the five years a total of 2,533,220,162 dollars in currency. That is an average of 36.8 cents a bushel in currency or thirty-five cents in gold.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr, won't you treat us fairly and compare the crop of 1872 with the crop of 1894 instead of mixing the figures up in that way?

Mr. Horr: I will give you those I have prepared. I don't mix anything. It is just as straightforward as it can be.

MR. HARVEY: You can get it from the book here on the table.

MR. HORR: Well, wait. Don't you want me to run this thing as I like? Or do you want me to run it entirely to suit you? (Laughter.) He sees what is coming, and he's in trouble, you know. In 1890 to 1894 they were raising annually on an average 1,602,170,857 bushels with a total value of $3,379,364,093 for the five years, which is 42.1 cents per bushel. Here is an advance in gold of 7.1 cents a bushel between the two series of years.

Now in the same period in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas the average gold value of corn fell from 63.5 cents to 58.3, or 5.2 cents a bushel.

In New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania the price advanced 1.6 cents a bushel. For several western states west of the Mississippi River the price advanced from 3.1 to 14.1 cents, an advance of 11 cents on a bushel in those states. From these summaries it can be seen that the average value per bushel advanced since 1875, although some farmers gained the larger share of the advance and some in certain sections saw the value of their corn depreciate.

Now in my next talk I will take up oats.

MR. HARVEY: We can reasonably suppose that if there is any virtue in the statement that has been made that the check system re-enforced our money in circulation, Mr. Horr would have closed with me and would have discussed it. Here we are trying to help the people discuss this question with information, and in its logical place I begin discussing the relation of checks and the bank system to our money, and Mr. Horr runs from it and tries to get at my flank, as it were. Now why does he do that? Why doesn't he join with me in dis-

cussing a proposition that we would all like to know the truth about? (Applause.)

I will adopt a compromise plan and will meet him in part on his own tactics.

As to corn. See Statistical Abstract, page 284. For 1872, we produced in the United States 1,002,719,000 bushels of corn. We then had a population of 40,596,-000. (See page 278.)

In 1894 the United States produced 1,212,770,052 bushels, with a population of 68,275,000; for 1872, $24\frac{2}{4}$ bushels per capita; for 1894, $17\frac{3}{4}$ bushels per capita. Seven bushels less per capita in 1894 than in 1872.

Take it another way.

The number of farm animals (corn-eating animals) in the United States for the years 1872 and 1895 is shown by the same Statistical Abstract, pages 293-294, and by taking the corn crop for these two years, as shown on page 294, we find that there were ten bushels of corn to each animal for the year 1872, and only seven and a half for each animal for 1894.

So we see less per capita per man and per animal in 1894. There was an over-supply of corn produced in 1872, affecting the market of 1873 with a low price, and a shortage of the corp per man and per animal in 1894, making a scarcity in 1895, and raising the price.

This is not all. The demand for corn has materially increased since 1873. It is now used more extensively in breweries. A new use has sprung up for it in glucose. Candy and molasses and many other things are made from it now that were not made from it in 1873. The demand for corn has increased, and the supply has decreased.

In examining every item, where for a moment it looks as if it had not been falling in price to correspond with the gold standard, you will find a reason for it.

The demand has increased enormously for corn, and the supply is less than it was in 1872. And yet while the price now ought to be eighty or ninety cents a bushel, as it would be under a bimetallic system, it is only about forty-five cents. (Applause.)

I criticise Mr. Horr for juggling figures. I don't mean that. I don't want to cast any aspersion on Mr. Horr. I want to treat him as a gentleman. But when he found the figures I used did not suit him it wasn't exactly fair for him to take eight or ten years and average them and fix it all up so nobody could tell whether he was traveling north or south. (Applause.)

THE NATIONAL BANKS ARE ORGANIZED.

I am going to discuss in fragments this credit system.

The national banks are organized to force down your throats, as it were, their monetary system, which I claim originated for their money-making purposes, and they are going to deceive you by such scoundrels as that man Scudder, and by similar articles in newspapers and otherwise, if they can. I'll read from a speech made here in this city by William C. Cornwall, president of the New York State Bankers' Association, last winter. He was speaking to bankers.

"If, in 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878 the bankers and sound-money men had been organized as they are organized now, and had spoken out as they are speaking out now, had started on a campaign of education, as they are starting out now, the greenback would long ago have been wiped out; the silver lunacy, before it had wrought incalculable damage, would have been confined to the asylums, where it belongs." (Applause.)

And further he says, and it is significant in view of what Mr. Horr has said in this debate:

"It is time to tear off disguise. International bimetallism is a traitor in the camp. It is a false friend.

It can never be accomplished. It is a will-o'-the-wisp dancing over the deadly marsh."

Now we are not surprised after playing that deception on us in party platforms for years,—we are not surprised now, when they think they have got us down and got both the old political parties in their clutches, and you scattered and poor, and a large percentage of your voters changing residence because they can't live in one place, become more or less tramps, now they propose to put the knife to us, and, as this banker says, throw off disguise. Nobody but a dishonest man would ever have worn disguise. (Continued applause and cries from the audience.)

Now, Mr. Horr comes here and tells you that silver was demonetized because gold is the best measure of values. When crowded with the logic and common sense that confronts him he makes an assertion that he would like to see all the nations, or enough of them, come together to adopt the double standard, right after having said that the nations in 1873, when we did have both metals, had demonetized silver because gold was the best measure of values. He is here to advocate that principle. He comes from a city where they are sending out circulars all over the country. One of them commences to read this way. It is from that bankers' organization in New York City (taking up a circular in his hand):

"We are convinced that the one thing that is wanted at present to help along the repeal of the Sherman Law (this was at that time) is a volley of petitions from southern and western cities and towns. The feelings and desires of the people of New York and Boston are perfectly well known in Washington to be in favor of the repeal."

Bankers all over the country were working up peti-

tions and sending them to Washington to influence congressmen. Again:

"We ask you to join us at once urging upon Congress and the President the immediate repeal of the Sherman Silver Law of 1890, for the reasons following."

They are organized and they are a great organization; and just as Mr. Horr's paper said that I read from in the Congressional Record, "Capital is organized, and Congress does not dare fly in its face." (Applause.)

MR. HORR: My friend Harvey is very much distressed because I insist upon discussing this question in a logical manner. (Laughter.) It bothers him terribly, but I don't blame him. The difficulty is, he has got a lot of essays that somebody has prepared, or he has, and if he isn't reading one of them he isn't happy. I don't happen to have that voluminous amount of stuff carefully written up for me by the various men who believe as I do, and I am trying to follow this discussion in the order of the business propositions that it involves, and if I am at times out of that part of the subject that Mr. Harvey is on I hope he will take it quietly, because I say to you, in his books he never yet discussed any subject in a logical, regular order. That is, if he ever did, he did it in his sleep, he never put it in any of his books.

I have one word more to say to the friends here whom the chair seems to have so much difficulty in keeping from being boisterous. I don't want you to cheer me. I notice that you become perfectly delighted, almost overwhelmed with joy, when Brother Harvey states that somebody is a scoundrel. The moment he sticks in an effort to prove the human race a set of vagabonds, and to prove that the human family is corrupt from beginning to end, you seem to take comfort from it (laugh-

ter), and you show you do, and delight yourselves. (Laughter and applause.) Now I am not constituted that way. It gives me nothing but grief to know that a human being has made a mistake or erred in the duties of life, and I don't want to get into a frame of mind so that I rejoice over the meanness of my fellow-men. I prefer to take comfort in cases of heroism, in cases of devotion to principle, in cases of self-sacrifice; and I will never stoop while I live to an attempt to get applause by tickling the palates of people who never enjoy life except they are where there is some carrion that they can sniff at. (Applause.) I like the sweet things of this life, and the pure things of this world, and get no comfort from the low and corrupt things that are now and then discovered, as I think, in only a few cases of the human race. Now to the oats. (Laughter.)

VALUE OF OATS, CORN, AND WHEAT.

In 1875 to 1879 the nation raised each year an average crop of 371,787,760 bushels, which were worth during those five years $5,835,065.04, or 31¼ cents per bushel in currency, or 29.8 cents in gold. In 1890 to 1895 the average annual oat crop was 644,788,355 bushels, with a total value for those five years of $1,066,-207,376, or 34.4 cents a bushel in gold. Here is a gain in the average value of 2.6 cents a bushel. The corresponding gain on the farms of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania is five cents a bushel. In the twelve central western states the advance was 5.9 cents a bushel. These figures show that the greatest cereals have not been decreased in price by the legislation of 1873. Silver has been constantly going down, corn and oats are higher in gold value than they were in the

five years previous to 1879. I know these figures are rather annoying to Brother Harvey, and for fear of ill results if I continue to refer to this class of statistics, of which there is no limit, I will now refer to wheat. Here are figures that will please my friend. I find the average annual price of wheat from 1875 to 1879 to have been 94.8 cents a bushel in gold, and for 1890–1894 it was 67.5 cents. Here is a marked decline. That decline was greater in the eastern states than in California and least in the northwest. The price of wheat was depressed because it was so largely exported. The value of the other grains was maintained —yes, advanced—because corn and oats are mainly marketed upon the farms upon which they are raised. Let us now strike a balance for these great cereals in the United States. The United States from 1875 to 1879 produced of corn, oats and wheat an annual average of 2,111,535,219 bushels, with an average annual value in currency of 46.7 cents a bushel, or 44.4 cents in gold. From 1890 to 1894 they raised an average crop of 2,723,-637,220, with an average value of 44.4 cents a bushel. This is exactly the same as the gold average for the years just before the silver legislation; before, according to Brother Harvey, the effect began to be felt in the prices of the United States. Now, here is a fixedness of price that is marvelous. It has no parallel in human history. It thoroughly explodes Mr. Harvey's theory and misstatements. He shows the price of a single commodity, for a single place, and argues a decline in value. I take the sum total of the vast production of the whole United States. I admit a variation in value between localities, and from year to year. Thus the average for the three grains in the twelve central western states, in the twenty years men-

tioned, advanced nine cents a bushel. There was a decline in the eastern and southern. The variation makes an effect upon farm values due to changed cost of transportation, but none are brought about by the change in the primary or any other money of the country. (Applause.)

NO DECLINE OF WHEAT IN SILVER COUNTRIES.

MR. HARVEY: A farmer in India or Mexico takes his wheat to the world's market at London, and sells it today for about $1.25 a bushel in silver, or for half that amount in gold, and with it buys the silver and takes the silver home with him—$1.25 per bushel—and pays with it $1.25 worth of debt. Now, before this change in our monetary system began, that $1.25 was about what the price of our wheat was. Hence the farmer in India and Mexico is still getting the price we once got in the honest currency of the country—silver. There is a stable currency for you. A debt contracted in 1872 could be paid now in those countries with the same number of bushels of wheat that it could then. We take our wheat to London and sell it for sixty-five cents, say, and bring it back here, and we can't, by any exchange for silver or otherwise, pay more than sixty-five cents of debt with it. (Applause.) I am going to settle this whole price question directly so that you can decide it right in your rooms at home. It has been so arranged by one of the greatest societies to promote civilization in the world, and I am going to place it directly in your hands. They have figured out what we are trying to do here and what Mr. Horr is making fruitless efforts to try to do.

THE USES AND ABUSES OF BANKS.

I now want the reader to connect what I am about to

say with what I was saying when Mr. Horr insisted on a diversion.

It is no answer for a banker to say that men are not compelled to borrow money and pay interest unless they want to. Business requires so much money, and the volume being insufficient, the business men are compelled to assist in this stretching process. We are now getting at the place from which all this financial wind and thunder comes—this influence, which has brought us panics and crushed our hopes as it loosened and contracted its use of this credit system; the same influence that took our government by the throat while her brave sons were exposing their lives upon the bloody fields of battle. Want, famine, prostitution, loss of character, and insanity now mark the low level of our national existence. Politicians deceive the people; national party platforms are a record of national duplicity and dishonor; and every effect and influence can be traced to this same power as it saps the veins of commerce and diverts from its channels the blood of civilization. The influence of these bankers on business men who want money and on our politicians extends throughout the Union.

We need banks of deposit and the convenience of checks and bills of exchange for transferring money, but we don't want banks to loan "bank wind" at an annual tax to us of $200,000,000 as a substitute for money,—that, as a sovereign people, we can bring into existence in sufficient quantity to transact our business.

The banks should go out of the government business instead of the government going out of the banking business. (Applause.) Let the banks be banks of deposit and discount, and not makers of money. They are making it now with bank credit, and you are pay-

ing them interest for it. The bankers, except those who are unselfish, will be found on the side of the gold standard or any system that limits the quantity of money and lets them supply bank credit at seven per cent.

There is another way—and a common-sense way—of estimating the quantity of money needed in the United States. This question of the quantity of money needed in the country is an important one. It will not do to meet it by saying that confidence is what is needed. This argument that confidence, and not money, is all that is wanted, if made by a greenbacker, would be ridiculed by those same men. Confidence won't buy anything; it will get a man in debt to a banker, that is all. It reminds me of a fable.

"An industrious Duck who had laid a great many eggs returned to her nest one day to find that they had all been stolen. Disconsolate, she set out in quest of them, when she met a Fox whose mouth bore evidences of a Burglary. 'Dear Sister Duck,' said he, 'I sympathize with you most deeply, but regret to notice your lack of Faith. Return immediately to your nest, and sit thereon with as much Confidence as formerly, and the Result will be, I assure you, as satisfactory as you desire.'" (Applause and laughter.)

The men living in the large cities, who are molding public opinion on this subject, try to teach the people how little money they need, and how confidence takes the place of money; and yet when these same people come to the cities—the World's Fair, for instance—they find they need money; that confidence is not currency. It takes money. The more money these "moneyed men" have, and the finer the outfits they drive, the less money they think other people need. I do not say

this to excite prejudice, but to show how people reason for themselves.

THE AMOUNT OF MONEY NEEDED.

Let us see how much money we need. Our population is now 68,000,000. Of this 40,000,000 are over the age of 20. Of this 40,000,000, 30,000,000 are married, and 10,000,000 are single adults. This is in round numbers.

Allowing $10 to each housewife, $10 to each husband and $10 to each single adult over 20 years of age to carry in their possession, we find $400,000,000 necessary. This allows nothing for those under 20 years of age. Let us count $50 to each business concern to keep at its place of business for the purpose of making change, and in this calculation I would include all railway stations where change is required.

Now do not stop and say you do not need that much, for you do, if we are to have prosperous business, and that is what we will have if we have our way.

By the Statistical Abstract of 1894, there was that year (page 367) 1,114,174 business concerns in the United States. The depots and other places needing ready money would bring the number up to 1,200,000. This would require $60,000,000 at hand by these concerns to facilitate business. Thus far we have $460,000,000 required to be in circulation among the people that would not be counted as a part of the money deposited in banks. This much would be in the pockets of the people, at their houses, and at their places of business.

No one will probably say that this estimate is too high. The average man should have $10 with him; if he hasn't it, he ought to have it. If he is a fit product

of civilization, he should have it. If he is not, it may be because he hasn't it.

The average housewife should certainly have at all times an average of $10 by her. She should at times have much more. They will all agree with me that they should have at least $10. We are a traveling people, a migratory people, and an average of $10 in our pockets, including unmarried people over 20 years of age, will not be objected to by any one as unreasonable, unless it should be Edward Atkinson of Boston, who has been trying to ascertain how little money people can get along with and yet live.

This makes $460,000,000 that should be in circulation among the people, in their possession.

The next question is, how much cash capital is necessary to conduct the business of the country. We have seen how much this is as indicated by the bank deposits and loans. I am now going to estimate it another way, that all men can grasp.

THE PRICE OF WHEAT HERE AND IN MEXICO.

Mr. Horr: I desire to say just one word in reference to the price of wheat. At our last session my friend Harvey stated that a man in Mexico could get $1.30 a bushel for his wheat, while it was only sixty-seven cents in Chicago and eighty-five cents in New York, and he stated that if we had free coinage in this country then the farmer would get $1.30 in this country just as they do in Mexico. I have not misrepresented you, Brother Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: No, sir, you have not.

Mr. Horr: Well, that is a marvelous proposition to anybody that can't think, you know. But it is ridiculous to a man who can use his head.

The man in New York and Chicago who sold his wheat got more for it than the man did in Mexico. The man in Mexico got $1.30 in Mexican money. The man who sold his wheat in New York or Chicago got American money—American money under a system run by business men who know something of business laws. The man who got his eighty-five cents for his wheat, who got $85 for a hundred bushels of wheat here in this country, can take his $85 and go to Monterey and meet his Mexican farmer who has just sold the same amount of wheat for 130 Mexican dollars, and he can step right into a bank and leave his $85 that he pocketed for his wheat here in Chicago or New York and ask the banker to let him have it in Mexican money, and he will give him $170 of Mexican money. (Applause.)

MR. HARVEY: You have twisted what I said. I said sixty-five cents, not eighty-five cents.

MR. HORR: It has not been down to sixty-five cents lately.

MR. HARVEY: The man who ships wheat from here to London won't get sixty-five cents back by about fifteen.

MR. HORR: Then it is lower in Mexico just the same. No doubt about it. (Laughter and applause.) The point I am trying to point out is, even if he got sixty-five cents in American money and the man in Mexico got $1.30 or $130 for 100 bushels, he could go right into the bank and swap his $65, and get 130 Mexican dollars for the same wheat that you talked about.

MR. HARVEY: But you couldn't pay $130 of debts with it.

MR. HORR: That is it. You couldn't pay somebody a debt with the same amount. I will come to that.

He fixes his whole theory of money, as I told you on

the start, on the ground that all it is used for is to help somebody pay an old debt, whereas what it should be used for is to pay men for what they do from day to day as they live and work. (Applause.)

Now, I have shown you that the three products, oats, corn and wheat, brought as much gold in the five years past as they would have brought before 1879, when silver was almost at par with gold.

Now what did the farmer do with his money? First, understand every one of those articles is modified by the invention of machinery, so that the farmers of the United States produced this last crop with a large amount less of human toil, and hence with a largely increased profit over what they received in 1874, 1875 and 1876. That is estimated at 20 per cent. That is, they produced by improvements those cereals that much cheaper at the last date than they did before. Now what could he buy with the money he got? I have first shown you that he got just as much gold as he did before. There are things that farmers have to buy, and before you can tell whether they have been ruined by these changes you must see how far that money would go in purchases. In 1873, when this act passed, calico averaged 11½ cents a yard. The farmer can buy it now for 5½ cents, cheapened not by cutting in two the measure of value, for we have the same measure of value we had then, but cheapened by the great law of cheaper production. Carpets which were then $1.35 a yard can be bought to-day for 45 cents. The suit of clothes that you had to pay $25 for can to-day be bought for $15. Tinware, for which you would have had to pay $5 then, can be bought to-day for $1.20. A reaper which then cost $170 can be bought to-day for $70. A mower which cost $90 then can be bought now for

$45. A wagon which you had to pay $90 for then can be bought to-day for $50. Tea which cost forty cents then can be bought to-day for 20 cents, the same grade of tea. Sugar which cost 12½ cents then can be bought to-day for 5 cents. Coffee to-day is about the same price it was in 1873. School and other books are about half what they cost in 1873.

This simply shows that the articles which are affected in their production by the improvements in machinery have fallen in price when thus cheapened on account of less hand work which enters into their production. Silver has been cheapened in precisely the same way. So have iron, copper, lead, aluminum and every other leading commercial article.

Mr. Harvey's idea about mining is singular. I suppose he has had some experience in mining; he has stated at all events a fact about mines that is true. Frequently your vein will be open and large, and then, before the sun goes down, it will, as the miners say, "pinch up" on them, "play out"—the miner's term is "peter out"—and they have nothing before them. It is so with every metal on the face of the earth that I have ever had any experience in mining.

Mr. Harvey: It is not true with iron.

Mr. Horr: It is true in a great many sections of the country with iron. The lead will run out. Iron, though, is very much more generally distributed. It is exactly true of lead, isn't it? I have worked in lead mines year in and year out, smelted and produced lead by the ton for years. It is true of zinc. It is true of all the metals and true of iron in a measure, though not to so great an extent.

But men never follow year in and year out any mining, when they put in three times as much as they take

out, as a whole. We would go without a metal that was produced that way, and the world would be entirely devoid of it in a little while.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr insists on his human-toil unit, but by that system he leaves that human toil with no unit to purchase what they must have. He throws that into the argument occasionally and I don't want it to deceive any one, and I may later read you what Mr. Horr says on that subject himself.

You may cheapen a thing with reference to the time required to produce it, but if the man that handles the machinery that does it does not get enough for his work to hold him up as a respectable citizen in the community, wherein does your cheapening process help him any? (Applause.)

Mr. Horr has been giving you an illustration of the gold standard by the fall of prices. I am very much obliged to Mr. Horr for that long list he went through, but there was one kind of property that Mr. Horr did not mention. It is property regarded by all people as the most desirable property in the world. Mr. Horr, you may mention oats, corn, beef, wheat and hundreds of other articles, but unless you name this one that I am going to mention you have not yet mentioned the article for which there is the most numerous and general demand in the world. It is a class of property for which men will travel to the ends of the world; for which men will at times risk their lives; a property that lures men to commit crime; a property which if you have it in your pocket you are perfectly safe as to dependency at any point in the world. That property is money. (Applause.) It has not declined. Do not let us be deceived with all this sophistry. Price is a relative term. We have a class of men that own

this kind of property that I have named—money. How are they benefited by this decline in the prices in that long list that Mr. Horr read? They go forth into the market with their money and buy property with it. You go into the market with your property, with your tin buckets, your reapers, your dozens of other things you mentioned to buy money, and you only buy one-half as much as you bought with them in 1873. (Long continued applause.)

NO DECLINE IN THE PRICE OF MONEY.

But these men in London and New England go into the market with their property—money—to buy your property that you have spent so much human toil over. (Applause.) And how much do they buy with *their* property? One-half as much as in 1873? No, sir, they buy twice as much. (Applause.) Gentlemen, there is by the United States census at the cash valuation $65,000,000,000 worth of property in the United States outside of money and securities, and the assessed value of it is $24,000,000,000. There is a class of men in this country who own money securities in a larger volume than the assessed value of all the property in the United States.

Now we may have a class of men owning cotton, or a class of men owning wheat, but none of those classes are near so large in interest—moneyed interest—as this class of men who are sowing money and reaping the harvest from it. And this crop which I call money is the crop that has been legislated in favor of. All commerce is an exchange of property, one property for another, and when you so legislate that the man owning one class of property can enhance the exchangeable value of that property in exchange for your property so

as to make his disproportionately more valuable than yours, you have legislated in the interest of that class. But you have done a more serious thing in this instance, because this class of property to which I now refer, money, is a class of property which you must have. You can do without wheat, because you can eat something else. You can do without beef, you can eat pork or mutton. You may exist without all those articles I have named, and yet you can be happy and prosperous. But here is legislation that has enhanced the exchangeable value of a class of property with your property that you must have. You might as well talk about doing without air and water as to talk about doing without money.

There is no condition of civilization that you can imagine by which you can be a part of that civilization and yet do without money. (Applause.) It is the blood of civilization, it is the life fluid of civilization, and it is property; and instead of our national laws protecting and seeing that it ran in the channel where it belonged to feed the social organism, it has been diverted and hoarded by these men who own it under laws encouraging them to do so. And by the legislation in 1873 it has been enhanced in exchangeable value with your property. That is the crucial point in this financial discussion. (Applause.) A man loaning money in 1872 that one thousand bushels of wheat would have paid—you must now give him two thousand bushels of wheat to pay that debt. (Applause.) That is true as applied to the price of wheat compared with 1884 and 1894. And that is the main point in this discussion. These men who own bonds payable in money and securities, payable in money aggregating more than all the assessed value of the property in the

United States, have legislated so as to enhance the value of their property until you have got to give up twice as much to them, when they come to buy your property, as they give up to you when you go with your hard earnings, with the product of your loom and your field, to buy their property. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: Now I want to call the attention of my friend to the fact that he can't get at how farmers are doing simply by selecting one article which happens to be cheap.

Mr. Harvey: I want to ask you right here, before these people, to answer my argument made just before I sat down.

INCREASED SAVINGS OF FARMERS.

Mr. Horr: I am going to do it if you will wait and keep still, that is what I am up here for now. (Laughter.) The very last thing he said was in reference to the fact that a farmer had to give twice as much wheat to pay his debt as he did before the demonetization of silver. What ails you? That is the very thing I am speaking about. Now I was stating that you can't possibly find out the facts in reference to the farmer simply by taking one article and that the lowest one you can find. Now I will call your attention to a confirmation of the figures which I have heretofore given. Those figures show that prices for farm products, all taken together, you know, have not declined. Here in the United States, comparing the present values to those of twenty years ago, I find my confirmation in an analysis of national wealth by the great statistical authority, Mr. Mulhall, so often quoted by Mr. Harvey. In the June *North American Review* Mr. Mulhall says that the average yearly accumulation of the agricultural

workers, per capita, of the United States, was, for the decade 1861 to 1870, $17.90 each.

Mr. Harvey: Will you pardon me—

Mr. Horr: Don't bother me. For the decade 1870 to 1880, $47.10 per capita; and for the decade 1881 to 1890, $47.50 per capita. Here is an ability on the part of the farmers of this country to save in the last census decade nearly three times as great as in the decade before the silver legislation of 1873. The savings of the last two decades are substantially the same, showing that prices must have been practically unchanged, as my figures would indicate—that is, prices of the whole taken together. But the significant fact to which Mr. Mulhall alludes is that the saving power of the agriculturists of the United States is now nearly three times what it was in Mr. Harvey's golden era, the decade before 1873. They have been doing better. That don't seem to rejoice you, friends, at all. It is only when they are doing worse that you feel glad. (Applause and laughter.)

Mr. Mulhall, in the same article, calls attention to the fact that for 20 years, 1850 to 1870, the annual increase in the United States national wealth averaged $846,000,000, while for the 20 years, 1870 to 1890,—and that is the time when he tells us the agricultural interests of this nation had been blighted by this gold-bug legislation, the average was $2,049,000,000, two and a half times as great. From this we see that during years in which, according to Mr. Harvey, we have been going to ruin, our savings were two and a half times as great as when he says we had prosperity. When we have proven Mr. Coin to be inaccurate, Brother Harvey disavows him; he dodges in a hundred ways; plays hide and seek with the words and their meanings.

Mr. Harvey: Didn't you have that written before you left New York? (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: He uses the words prosperity and ruin, meaning exactly the opposite of ordinary mortals. I know your folly. It is a kind of a disease. When men get it, they take everything wrong end first always. That is a peculiarity of men in that state of mind. When the values of the grain of the nation are advancing he says they are depreciating. When the nation is adding most to its values, it is going to ruin in his eyes. But my friend and the free-silver men of the South may argue that in my figuring, calculations along two independent lines, and reaching conclusions practically the same, are insufficient because they do not include that other factor; that is, cotton. This staple, being quite largely exported, has declined in price, as has its great export rival, wheat. Let us see if we cannot make a comparison that will remove this objection of my friend.

I now present a statement of nine agricultural staples expressed in tons. Mark, now, in tons, together with the value of the same for the two five-year periods from 1875 to 1879, and 1890 to 1894. They are corn, hay, cotton, wheat, oats, potatoes, barley, rye, and buckwheat. From this table I find that the average of these nine staples for the first period was $17.10 in currency, or $16.26 per ton in gold, and in the last period was $15.56 per ton in gold. If figures had been given by the agricultural department for fruits, garden truck, peanuts, and tobacco, the results would have shown as close an agreement as those already given for wheat, corn, and oats. Where, Mr. Harvey, in these averages involving thousands of millions of dollars' worth of farm property,—I say, where is the

evidence of ruin for the farmer and of a decline in farm prices of which your inspired boy, without a knowledge of mathematics and the facts, has been telling the country so much? That ruin and that decline, save in exceptional cases, exists only in the nooks and crannies of a diseased imagination and in the brains of boys like "Coin," who borrow their inspiration from sources of which no man has any knowledge. I want to present this table as part of my remarks where I have compared the rates of tons,—the price per ton, showing the condition as I claim.

A COMPARATIVE EXHIBIT OF THE PRODUCTION IN TONS AND THE VALUE OF THE LEADING AGRICULTURAL STAPLES FOR THE TWO PERIODS OF 1875 TO 1879 AND 1890 TO 1894.

Name	Products. 1875—1879	Products. 1890—1894	Home Value. 1875—1879	Home Value. 1890—1894
Corn.......	92,740,051	224,303,967	$2,533,220,162	$3,379,364,093
Hay*......	65,471,296	301,601,415	1,531,387,893	2,598,502,980
Wheat.....	54,204,970	71,501,704	1,812,912,635	1,609,431,676
Cotton.....	5,351,550	9,786,013	1,157,450,641	1,503,281,271
Oats.......	30,672,424	53,195,040	583,506,504	1,066,007,376
Potatoes*.	22,976,472	26,539,615	377,343,108	500,471,470
Barley*....	4,622,142	7,876,197	125,913,595	139,683,780
Rye*.......	3,044,979	3,729,814	68,910,878	67,519,245
Buckwh't*.	1,438,182	1,560,032	35,496,886	35,286,720
Total....	480,522,066	700,093,797	8,226,142,302	10,899,548,611

MR. HARVEY: I submit that Mr. Horr did not answer my question. He attempted to show that prices had been reduced in his former speech, and read a long list of articles that had been reduced in price, and he now tries to take the other track and say they have not been, —he does not do it specifically, but leaves you to infer it. No man can carry water on both shoulders with the

*The agricultural department only gives figures for these staples for the last two years of the latter period. The figures for that period are here estimated upon the basis of those given for 1893 and 1894.

American people for the next two years. (Applause.) Now let me show you what he did. He said that we had increased in wealth. Nobody disputes that. Nor does our increase in wealth go to show that my proposition was not true, that the owners of money and securities are exchanging their property and absorbing yours. We are increasing in wealth, Mr. Horr. The United States has not only been a workshop in producing wealth, but it has been a sweat-shop. (Applause.) It has been producing wealth, but have the men who produced that wealth got the wealth? No, wealth is rapidly concentrating in the direction I pointed out to you in my last statement, and I gave you the causes for it.

Now I am going to give you what I think will settle in your minds this whole question of prices. The exchange value of money for property has increased abnormally by reason of the reduced quantity of primary money in the world.

MR. SAUERBECK AND THE ROYAL STATISTICAL SOCIETY.

In England there was founded in 1834 an organization, a society for the advancement of science by researches into statistical and similar matters, which was called "The Royal Statistical Society," and a journal published in London says:

"The society was founded in pursuance of a recommendation of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, on the 15th of March, 1834; its object being, the careful collection, arrangement, discussion, and publication of facts bearing on and illustrating the complex relations of modern society in its social, economical, and political aspects—especially facts which can be stated numerically and arranged in tables—and also to form a statistical library as rapidly as its funds would permit."

That society is composed of men who are uninfluenced by wealth or by the patronage of political office; men devoutly engaged in the study of "Why we are on this earth, and what is necessary to advance us to a higher state." They have in that society an honored man whom they claim as the first statistician in the world, Augustus Sauerbeck. I now make a part of my remarks a table* prepared by Mr. Sauerbeck and a part of the official files of that society, showing the prices substantially of all property in the world that seeks the world's markets. It explains itself, and in that table he includes silver. I hand these tables around among the audience.

A study of this table would settle this whole question that we are discussing in this country,—I mean an unselfish study of it; not a study to stick it in the flank or to see where you could confuse some one, but an unselfish study of that unselfish table made by unselfish men; then you would settle this silver question in twenty-four hours afterward if you had a chance to vote on it. (Applause.) It shows you that the price of silver was steady in its exchange value with other property down to 1873. It shows you how prices have fallen since 1873. It does not isolate corn or oats, and try to mislead you; but it takes all the properties, and it shows you a ruinous decline in the average of property since 1873. (Applause.) It shows you conclusively

*The table on the opposite page was calculated by Augustus Sauerbeck, Esq., of 3 Moorgate St. Building, London, and published in the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, London, September, 1886, March, 1892, and March, 1895. The commodities are the forty-five leading articles of commerce. His work shows the greatest care and is accepted as reliable by all others who have undertaken the same work. The table is by index numbers. The 100, or index number, with which the average is compared for each year, is arrived at by taking the average prices for twenty-five years, 1853-1877. With 100 thus used to represent this average price (1853 to 1877), the price of each year is compared. His calculation is on the ratio of 15 ½ of silver to 1 of gold

YEAR.	Vegetable Food (corn, etc.)	Animal Food (meat, etc.).	Sugar, Coffee and Tea.	Total Food.	Minerals.	Textiles.	Sundry materials.	Total materials.	Grand Total.	Silver.
1846	106	81	98	95	92	77	86	85	89	97.5
1847	129	88	87	105	94	78	86	86	95	98.1
1848	92	83	69	84	78	64	77	73	78	97.8
1849	79	71	77	76	77	67	75	73	74	98.2
1850	74	67	87	75	77	78	80	78	77	98.7
1851	73	68	84	74	75	75	79	76	75	99.9
1852	80	69	75	75	80	78	84	81	78	99.9
1853	100	82	87	91	105	87	101	97	95	101.2
1854	120	87	85	101	115	88	109	104	102	101.1
1855	120	87	89	101	109	84	109	101	101	100.7
1856	109	88	97	99	110	89	109	102	101	101.0
1857	105	89	119	102	108	92	119	107	105	101.5
1858	87	83	97	88	96	84	102	94	91	101.0
1859	85	85	102	89	98	88	107	98	94	102.0
1860	99	91	107	98	97	90	111	100	99	101.4
1861	102	91	96	97	91	92	109	99	98	99.9
1862	98	86	98	94	91	123	106	107	101	100.9
1863	87	85	99	89	93	149	101	115	103	101.1
1864	79	89	106	88	96	162	98	119	105	100.9
1865	84	97	97	91	91	134	97	108	101	100.3
1866	95	96	94	95	91	130	99	107	102	100.5
1867	115	89	94	101	87	110	100	100	100	99.7
1868	113	88	96	100	85	106	102	99	99	99.6
1869	91	96	98	94	89	109	100	100	98	99.6
1870	88	98	95	93	89	106	99	99	96	99.6
1871	94	100	100	98	93	103	105	101	100	99.7
1872	101	101	104	102	127	114	108	115	109	99.2
1873	106	109	106	107	141	103	106	114	111	97.4
1874	105	103	105	104	116	92	96	100	102	95.8
1875	93	108	100	100	101	88	92	93	96	93.3
1876	92	108	98	99	90	85	95	91	95	86.7
1877	100	101	103	101	84	85	94	89	94	90.2
1878	95	101	90	96	74	78	88	81	87	86.4
1879	87	94	87	90	73	74	85	78	83	84.2
1880	89	101	88	94	79	81	89	84	88	85.9
1881	84	101	84	91	77	77	86	80	85	85.0
1882	84	104	76	89	79	73	85	80	84	84.9
1883	82	103	77	89	76	70	84	77	82	83.1
1884	71	97	63	79	68	68	81	73	76	83.3
1885	68	88	63	74	66	65	76	70	72	79.9
1886	65	87	60	72	67	63	69	67	69	74.6
1887	64	79	67	70	69	65	67	67	68	73.3
1888	67	82	65	72	78	64	67	69	70	70.4
1889	65	86	75	75	75	70	68	70	72	70.2
1890	65	82	70	73	80	66	69	71	72	78.4
1891	75	81	71	77	76	59	69	68	72	74.1
1892	65	84	69	73	71	57	67	65	68	65.4
1893	59	85	75	72	68	59	68	65	68	59.6
1894	53	80	65	66	64	53	64	60	63	47.6
Average, 1878-1887	79	95	76	84	73	71	81	76	79	82.1
Average, 1885-1894	65	83	68	72	71	62	68	67	69	60.2

how the men who own money, and securities payable in money, dominate you, absolutely dominate the toilers and producers of the world.

Now I want the reader to connect what I was saying, when I was trying to arrive at how much money we needed in this country, with what I am about to say.

By the Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 367, there were, as I have stated, in that year, 1,114,174 business concerns in the United States. This means business concerns such as the mercantile agencies are asked to report on; men asking credit and buying and selling merchandise, from the wholesale house that requires a million dollars capital, down to the corner grocery store. It does not include lawyers. It does not include doctors, unless they are running drug-stores, and does not include tens of thousands of citizens who need money; but I am going to leave these all out of my calculation. I am going to take these business concerns that need cash capital, and average their cash capital at $4,000. They ought to have it if they haven't. The average profits from business is less than six per cent. That much on $4,000 for one year is $240. A man ought to make that much, which with his own labor might support his family if he had no rent to pay. I say this to show that $4,000 in money is an average small capital, while many must be much larger. This would require for the business of the country $4,400,000,000. You could not have less than this without making it necessary for some one to borrow. Add to this the $460,000,000 and you have $4,860,000,000. This does not vary far from the other estimate of $4,800,000,000 shown as now required, and that did not include money outside of banks or the cash capital of banks.

No one can answer this by saying this is too much money, for this much money or its substitutes is now required. As it is now, a class of men—non-producers—are living off you by an occupation that furnishes it to you with bank credit. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: I desire to say in my closing remarks that before the debate ends I shall attempt to show the people of this country that banks are just as great a blessing to the world, and as necessary a part of civilization, as railroads and machinery, and any other modern improvement that has blessed the toiling millions. But I shall do it in the regular order. I cannot be swerved from the regular order. (Laughter and applause.) Before I say anything else, I want to call attention to the question, Brother Harvey, you asked me, because you might think I slighted you if I paid no attention to it. I will read it again, so we will understand it:

"I am going to ask Mr. Horr a question, and if he fails to answer it in harmony with his theory, I ask a verdict against him."

I want to say a word just there: That is nice enough in talking, but if you had a true conception you would have said, if I fail to answer it according to the truth, I shall call him to account, for you know I may be wrong —I don't think I am, but I am not dead sure that I am right on everything in this world. A man who has lived as long as I have and has had the headache from the study of as many questions, has learned that he may be mistaken.

"The table on production of silver for the world shows the world's production in 1860 to have been $40,000,000, and that the production increased each year till in 1872, twelve years later, when it was $65,250,000. Here was an increase of 64 per cent in twelve years. Now, if you are right, why did not this increase break

down the price of silver? And before you answer I will call your attention to the twelve years, 1872 to 1884, where the increase is 63 per cent, 1 per cent less than the previous twelve years, during which time the price of silver had fallen 17 per cent."

Now he wants me to answer that question. Here it is: The reason why silver did not fall more between 1860 and 1872 was because of the enormous demand for it in the Orient. Mulhall (page 309) gives the imports to India alone from 1860 to 1870 at $500,000,000, while from 1870 to 1880 she took only $250,000,000. The entire production of silver from 1860 to 1870 was $500,000,000 and was entirely absorbed by India alone, while the production from 1870 to 1880 was $655,000,000 more than India absorbed. The difficulty is that silver, like everything else, is affected in its price by the demand for its use. It may have been affected by the fact that people have ceased to hoard it as in days gone by; there are a dozen reasons why the people, not wanting a thing, don't take it, that's all. It is not because there is less silver used as money, because there is an enormously increased amount used as money. I will not stop now to show the exact figures, but the increase as I remember it, since 1873, of silver that has been absorbed into use as money is something like $1,300,000,000, so when a man says that silver is demonetized by any nation on the face of the earth—unless he gives a definition to "demonetized" that is not in the dictionary—he states a thing that is not true. Silver was refused free coinage, and consequently ceased to be the measure of value in all the civilized nations of the world, but the demand for silver as money was not decreased by that legislation, and Mr. Harvey will not claim that.

Mr. Harvey: I do.

Mr. Horr: Well then, you claim it in the face of the facts of history. We have coined since the demonetization act of 1873 over $600,000,000, if my memory serves me right, in this country, or have it in the form of bullion in the treasury, which we have taken from the markets of the world and paid for in cash—there is no doubt about it. Now I submit to the people of the United States that I have shown beyond all question that the farm products of the country have not suffered, as my friend claims, at all. He knows it if he has looked it up as I have. He now comes back at me and tells you that I blow hot and I blow cold. (Laughter.) He says in one minute I am claiming that productions are high, and in the next that they are low. Well, I don't know that I can make him understand it, but I think the majority of this audience will understand it. I believe you who cheered with him so vociferously, who were so marvelously pleased when he mentioned in his last speech that we had "sweat-shops" in this country (laughter), you didn't find any place to cheer Harvey when he stated that there was a pure, upright society of gentlemen, and located them in London. (Laughter.) I haven't had anything do me so much good since this debate began as to hear Harvey say that there is a set of honest, unselfish, upright people in the world, and then locate them in England, a country which the boy "Coin" wants us to go to war with, regardless of consequences. That is the most marvelously pure set of men ever discovered on the face of the earth. I am glad you found them, Harvey; it does me good to have purity and excellence discovered anywhere on the face of the earth.

Now, as to the figures that he quotes of the Englishmen who belong to that pure society, he gave the fig-

ures of prices in England, prices ranging in a country where nobody claims, who knows anything about it, that the laboring men have the comforts of life that they have here in the United States. Before I finish I will show you that we here in the United States have a better distribution of property, that the common laboring men of this country, under gold legislation, enjoy more of the comforts of life, than any people to be found anywhere under God's burning sun. (Applause on the gold side of the house.)

Why don't you cheer over on this side? (Applause on both sides, and long continued.)

Now you are really glad, ain't you, that there is some comfort left for the people in the United States?

THE BATTLE OF LIBERTY.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr calls my attention to the fact that I have located some pure men in England.

I want to say to our people in America that there are pure people in England, in France, in every portion of the world, but their hopes of liberty and civilization are not what ours are. (Applause.)

We are to-day fighting the battle of liberty in this country, and that society that I mentioned in London is cheering us on with words of good-will. (Applause.)

A human heart will beat with the same emotions in England that it will here. The men who are controlling the financial legislation of England are men like the Rothschilds, men who are dealers in money, and whose property is fixed incomes. They are the gilded light and influence around the throne; they absolutely dominate it and control it in all kingdoms and monarchies.

Human nature there as here is to pander to the rich. If a man is rich, one feels, as it were, like sinking his

opinion and deferring to that man for his judgment, and when the time comes, that man whose judgment is deferred to, is going to cast his judgment on that subject in his personal interest. The man who defers to him is in the same condition as the lamb which undertakes to lie down with the tiger, if their interests conflict.

You take a slave-owner before the war, who sat upon his elegant front porch with its white pillars. His poor neighbor deferred to him, and it was his opinion that dominated that neighborhood.

Now we have a class of people controlling in the world who are dealers, not in slaves, but in money, and as they grow rich and opulent, and you grow poor and seek them for their money, you grow obeisant, and those rich men are controlling the legislation of America and the old world, and there is no plan by which European civilization can rise from under it, and when we have passed four or eight years further along there will be no way for us to rise from under it.

We are making in the United States to-day the last stand of freemen in the civilization of the world. (Applause.) That same money-lending influence arose two thousand years ago, and struck down civilization. While exerting its prejudice and its power, it struck down the purest men of those days. It struck down Jesus Christ himself!

It is again dominating the world. It now raises its head in this country, and unless you rouse your manhood and exert your intelligence it will absorb you in its influence and destroy human liberty here in America. (Applause.)

When we have passed a few years further along, and you have been made to know more fully that property

is worth more than humanity, that a globule of gold is worth more than a drop of blood, as you have been taught in the last twenty years and are being taught now, you will find that your dearest constitutional rights will be trampled down by the martial tread of troops. While confusion and restlessness prevail with the lack of prosperity all over our land, causing men to do things they would not do if they were prosperous, causing riots and strikes, you will find that these men who harbor wealth, and bend their knees in supplication to wealth, will not stop to consider what there is in civilization that is wrong, that has brought this on, but they will say that "property must be protected." The bullet will be the whistling messenger of peace, and they will know no law but power, and then you will have lost your liberties guaranteed to you by the constitution.

First will come the loss of free speech; next the loss of a free press; and lastly you will be intimidated until you become virtually slaves, as they have become already in Europe. (Applause.)

We are to-day repeating the history of the money-changers of two thousand years ago, and the true secret of it all is that you worship money; that you worship a god here on earth that to you is more sacred than the rights of humanity. (Applause.)

That working-men are out of employment, that three hundred men in Coal Valley, Illinois, have offered to bind themselves in slavery for a living in the last few days, does not excite your compassion for a moment. What does?

The mad pursuit for money! If you can only say that you are worth a million dollars, you regard it as of more benefit to you than if you could say that

you had given prosperity to a thousand men who are now tramping your streets without a place to find employment. And with this worshiping of money has come another form of selfishness, the selfishness of vanity. Those who are deceiving us are but the willing tools of this other selfish power, and the form that their selfishness takes is vanity. They would rather see their picture in a newspaper, and be lauded, than to do a good deed.

And in their desire for office where they can satisfy their vanity they are willing to bow their heads in submission to the moneyed power, that influence which supplies the campaign fund, and the power which they recognize will put them in office. (Long continued applause.)

QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE.

This ended the debate for the day, and written questions were then received from the audience to be answered by the debaters.

Mr. Horr: Question by James H. Daskin, of Jacksonville, Ill. "The Republican platform declares for the use of both gold and silver as standard money. Is silver standard money to-day? and, if not, are you in favor of making it so? or do you favor the elimination from the Republican platform of 1896 of the words 'standard money' as applied to silver?"

I desire to say to the committee who submitted this question to me that it is doubtful whether this illustrates in any way the subject we are discussing. It is a question simply asked by some politician for a political purpose, and I don't think comes properly in this debate. At the same time there isn't anything about it dangerous at all to me, because I am not enough of

a politician to hurt, you know. In the first place, I will answer this friend by telling him he has not quoted enough of the platform of the Republican party to show what the platform is on that subject. He has taken out one clause, the thing I complained of about Brother Harvey, without the other part of the resolution being with it, which does not even show the spirit or meaning of that platform. If he had quoted the whole of it, he would not have asked the question, because the platform is as clear as day—that they are for the use of both metals, keeping all of equal value with each other, and they are in favor of silver being used as standard money wherever, by international agreement, we can get silver into that relation, and also prevent the destruction of the measure of values in the United States. Nowhere in any place have the Republican party ever announced the doctrine that they desired to put this nation upon a silver basis, and use silver alone as the measure of value and make gold subsidiary to silver. Nowhere. I desire to say this, that should I be in the next Republican convention, and have anything to do with their platform, I should endeavor to have one that would not vary a hair from these principles I have been announcing here in this discussion. And I serve notice on my friend who wrote the question that we will have a platform that will win on this question too. (Applause.)

MR. HARVEY: Question by S. A. Robinson, of New York. "You have stated that we owe England on private and public bonds five thousand million dollars. Please inform the people when we received the five thousand million."

I stated in "Coin's Financial School" in the last chapter that we owed England, or Europe, I don't know

which, but we will say England, about five thousand million dollars. Mr. Robinson wants to know when we received it. I will tell him. We have floated in national, state, municipal and corporate bonds, twenty thousand million dollars, twenty billion as you call it by the French count. Now I claim that at least five thousand million of that, or one quarter of it, is held among the money-lenders of Europe, principally in England. There is probably more than that held among them. There is no definite way for getting at it. *The Chicago Tribune* estimated it recently at a little over half that, but the *Tribune* was trying to make it as small as possible. I did not try to make it as large as possible. I will tell you now in the short space I have of 300 words, without the other data here that I might use, how you can figure that. The man who loans you money in New York we know as a fact is following a system of re-hypothecating that loan in Europe. He will take your bond here, the broker will, he re-sells it in New York, then New York to London. Recently we know it is impossible almost to place a bond in our own country. The United States bonds have had to be floated in Europe. The three-million Chicago bonds the other day had to be floated in London, and express messengers left here with the bonds for London. Now during the last twenty years our railroad bonds, which alone are five thousand million, and a part of this other fifteen thousand million—that is a part of all of it, and a very large part of it—has been floated in England during the last twenty years, and if I had longer to answer—and I may have to-morrow—I could give you the data on this subject—and we are paying interest on those bonds.

Mr. Horr: Question from Dr. T. P. Seeley, Chicago.

"Did not the sudden drop of 20 per cent in the value of silver bullion in 1893, immediately after the British Council stopped its free coinage in India, demonstrate that the cost of production had not fixed its value, but that a change of law and demand did change it? and how do you explain the sudden rise in the price of silver from 96 cents per ounce to $1.21 in 1890?"

I say in reference to the fall of silver immediately after the act of the British Council in reference to the coining of it in India, it is a subject that I know very little about. If any of you are able to dig out the relation between the prices of articles and the system they have of money in India, you have been able to do something that I have never yet succeeded in satisfying myself about. I suppose that the price of silver must have been somewhat affected by the fact that India did stop receiving as much as she had before. It cut off the demand, and when you do that it cuts off one of the places of demand, and when you do that it necessarily drives down the price of any article. In 1890 there was for a little while in this country—I know about that, I was here, you know—there was an inflation of the price brought about by the purchase of a large amount of silver under the Sherman act. And for a little time speculators and the extra demand—that enormous amount taken incidentally by the government—drove the price up. But they continued to take it month after month for three years, and the price itself, without regard to the purchase, commenced to decline, and has been declining from that day until within the last six months.

Mr. Harvey: Question by H. L. Bliss, Chicago. "The figures of gold production since 1890 of the table presented Tuesday and 'Coin's Financial School' are as follows:

	Coin.	Table.
1890	$113,150,000	$118,849,000
1891	130,579,000	126,184,000
1892	130,818,000	138,860,000

Please reconcile."

The original table of the production of gold and silver in the world that was published in the first edition of "Coin's Financial School" was made from that chart issued by the Treasury Department at Washington. The chart I refer to is the one I hold in my hand, and was carefully proof-read and is a duplicate of that table. August 16, 1893, is the date on the table. Now, then, after something like 200,000 books had been printed from that plate, the plate was broken at the press-room, and Mr. Knapp had it re-set and proof-read without calling my attention to it, believing that they could do it just as carefully as I could. He didn't understand how easy it was to make a mistake, and there is a slight mistake or two in that table as re-set at the press-rooms. And as soon as I heard of it I had it carefully examined and found there was no mistake that affected a principle. There were two or three small mistakes. It would not mislead one except that it would look inaccurate to any one comparing. And I immediately had it re-set, and in re-setting it took it from the table that is reproduced in the treasurer's report of 1894, and it varies a little from the treasurer's table sent out in 1893. As I said the other day, they make those slight mistakes where they handle so many figures at Washington. And the table as it now appears in "Coin's Financial School" is made from the treasury table of 1894. But no mistake that ever occurred would change or affect a principle that the table taught.

Mr. Horr: Question from F. J. Schulte, Chicago. "Would not the demonetization of gold have the effect

of diminishing its value regardless of the cost of production?"

My answer to that question is that it assumes that it is possible to demonetize gold. All the nations in the world couldn't demonetize gold. They haven't the power to do it by law in any way possible. Why? Why, people use gold as money because they want it, because they prefer it, because it suits them, and when a man wants to use a thing he is going to use it. Do you think by passing a law you could de-bread wheat—stop the people of the world from using wheat any more for bread? You couldn't. You may think you could, but you couldn't. It is beyond the province of law. Now if the United States alone had passed a law as to gold the same as they did as to silver, and had placed this nation on a silver basis instead of a gold one, it would not have affected the price of gold one iota, no more than did the demonetization of silver by the English nation in 1816.

The world uses gold to-day as the measure of value, in all international matters, not because there is any law. Gold coin, as coin, has no international standing. And yet we are just as completely in our recognition of it as a measure of value as if you passed a law. Now I will answer in a word; if governments had let the two metals alone, and had let the people of the world always determine by their contracts just the amount of gold to be paid for a certain thing, or just the amount of silver, and had never attempted to get up ratios between the two metals, we never would have had any bother on this question. Everything would be run by people according to their understanding, that they should keep their contracts, and if they said wheat, pay in wheat; if they said gold, pay

in gold; if they said silver, pay in silver. Let the people run their business—they are able to do it.

MR. HARVEY: Question by L. G. Powers, of Minnesota. "The export price of wheat (gold) was in 1873 $1.16; 1892, $1.03. Grain rates Chicago to New York were in 1873, 47 cents; in 1892, 22 cents per hundred. With a proportionate reduction from Nebraska points, how much more did the Nebraska farmer receive for wheat in 1892 than in 1873?"

This question does not state the truth in regard to these figures. It is easy enough for him to get the true figures. If this question were reframed, then I could answer it; but, in order not to let it go without an answer of some kind, I say this: that the construction of no hypothetical question can convince a farmer that he is getting more now for his wheat than he received in 1873. (Long continued applause.)

Adjourned to Saturday, July 27, at 1 o'clock P. M.

CHAPTER IX.

THE EIGHTH DAY.—WAGES AND PRICES.—BANKS AND FAILURES—DEBTS AND MORTGAGES.

Mr. Horr: During my remarks at the last session I stated that when you take all the human productions together with the great product known as human labor, gold had not appreciated in value since 1873; and that when measured in human toil it had depreciated. I stated also that after 20 years under a gold standard in this country the farmer can purchase with the products of his farm more of the things which he needs to buy to-day than he could in 1873. More than that—I now state that when the entire products of the farm are taken into account, they will bring as much money of final redemption as they would have brought in 1873.

I now desire to show the condition of all the products of this entire country. I take the prices of wages from the report of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, computed under the direction of Commissioner Carroll D. Wright. The country knows who he is. No man in the United States has done more in his efforts to serve the real interests of the working-man than has Mr. Wright. I here give a table which shows the cost of several classes of products, the average wages of men who worked at all kinds of labor, from 1860 up to 1890. This table is computed on the plan of starting in 1860 with 100 as the basis. The table I will insert and have printed as a part of my remarks.

PRICES, WAGES AND PURCHASING POWER.

	1860	1865	1870	1875	1880	1885	1890
Meat	100	197	174.3	140.4	103.6	107.6	99.6
Other food	100	240.3	146.3	135	116.9	97.2	103.5
Clothes and clothing	100	299.2	139.4	120.1	104.5	84.8	82.4
Fuel and lighting	100	237.8	196.5	156.5	100.2	89.6	92.5
Metals and implements	100	191.4	127.8	117.5	96.3	77.4	73.2
Lumber and building materials	100	182.1	148.3	143.7	130.9	126.6	123.7
Drugs and chemicals	100	271.6	149.6	144.2	113.1	86.9	87.9
House furnishing	100	181.1	121.6	95	85 2	70.1	69.5
Miscellaneous	100	202.8	148.7	122.9	109.8	97.5	89 7
Average of all prices	100	216.8	142.3	127.6	106.9	93	92.3
Average of all wages	100	143.1	162 2	158.4	141.5	150.7	158.9
Average wages by importance	100	148.6	167.1	158	143	155.9	168.2
Salaries of city teachers	100	134.7	186.3	188.1	182.8	186.3	186.3
Paper money	100	49.5	81.1	88.8	100	100	100
Gold price of silver bullion in Lond'n	100	99	98.2	92.2	84.7	78.7	77.4
Purchasing power of all wages	100	66	114.1	124.1	132.3	162	172.1

You will notice that in 1865 the prices were nominally high—the table shows that—on account of their being given in the cheap money used in this country at that time. The wages of 1860 had been computed when the gold dollar was our measure of value. In 1865, the greenback, in which we were measuring values, was worth only 49½ cents on the dollar. All prices had advanced, when named in paper money, to 216.8. Wages had advanced to 143.1 per cent, but owing to the unusual advance in the price of products and of wages, the purchasing power of wages was only .66.

Now, what occurred after the passage of the law of 1873? Those occurrences have a direct bearing on the question we are discussing. We resumed specie payments in 1879, and, as Mr. Harvey himself stated, you cannot get at the real changes occasioned by the law until after we resumed specie payment. By that time the high prices had fallen off—that is, the nominal prices—because the measure in which they had been valued had been advancing all the while, not on account of any change in the value of gold, but on account of the paper money which we were using as the measure constantly appreciating in value until it finally reached par with gold. At that time prices as compared with

1860 were as 106.9 to 100, and wages were as 141.5 to 100—showing that the wage-earners were receiving much better pay—nearly fifty per cent—than they received in 1860. But the purchasing power of wages was 132.3 instead of 100, while the average amount had increased from 100 in 1860 to 141.5.

Now labor was better paid and men enjoyed the necessaries and comforts of life to an enormously greater degree, notwithstanding silver had at that time declined from 100 to 84.7. Thus it will appear that in 1890 all wages had risen from 100 to 158.9, and the purchasing power of wages had increased more than 72 per cent.

In 1870 the average of all prices was 142.3; wages, 162.2; and the purchasing power in greenbacks was 114.1.

In 1890 prices were 92.3; wages 158.9; and their purchasing power in gold 172.1—showing that the wage-earner for his day's work got one and nearly three-fourths times as much of the things he needed in 1890 as he could have got in 1870.

Now these figures, taken from the report of the Commissioner of Labor of the United States, made for the purpose of favoring no particular notion, but simply for the purpose of getting at the facts, show conclusively that every proposition which Mr. Harvey has made during this debate in reference to the effects of the gold standard upon the producers and wage-earners of this country is untrue. It was in view of these facts that I made the broad assertion that at no time during the history of this or any other nation has a people enjoyed more of the comforts of life, and the general prosperity of all kinds of business been more complete, than in the years between 1879 and 1892. The increase of wealth in this country during that time was enormous.

Now, Mr. Harvey, you gave us a table from the statistician, Sauerbeck, whom you vouched for in such glowing terms. Sauerbeck gave the prices of only forty-five articles used in England. The committee based this table upon the prices of 226 articles used here in the United States, and I will have printed as a part of my remarks a list of 65 articles selected from the 226 mentioned in the Senate committee's report, and I hand the list to the reporter.

ARTICLES OF WHICH PRICES ARE TAKEN.

Beans, bread, butter, cheese, coffee, eggs, fish, apples, lard, pork, beef, mutton, milk, rice, spices, starch, sugar, tallow, potatoes, cotton, woolen and cotton cloths, carpets, hides, leather, coal, candles, matches, iron, copper, lead, nails, knives, quicksilver, rope, saws, silver, scythes, shovels, brick, zinc, cement, lumber, lime, plate glass, shingles, tar, window glass, alcohol, alum, flaxseed, glycerine, linseed oil, opium, quinine, chairs, tables, molasses, glassware, pails, tubs, gunpowder, rubber, soap, poultry, flour.

MR. HARVEY: It would be fairer to print them all.

MR. HORR: Now, what I ask you, as I close my first talk, is this: Why did you select your data from England, and undertake to base your argument upon English prices, when you could have found the prices all tabulated and shown accurately by a committee of your own country, about articles which we are using here in the United States? What difference does it make to us here in the United States what Sauerbeck's tables show about the condition of affairs over in England? What we are after is to find out how this law has affected the people of this country (applause), and what will be the effect, if you establish your doctrine of the free coinage of silver, on the people here where we live.

MR. HARVEY: In the last debate Mr. Horr said:

"I will now refer to wheat. Here are figures that will please my friend. I find the average price of wheat from 1875 to 1879 to have been 99.8 cents a bushel in gold."

Further on he said:

"Now I have shown you that the three products, oats, corn, and wheat, brought as much gold in the five years past as they would have brought before in 1879, when silver was almost at par with gold."

Mr. Horr took his figures on wheat there given evidently from page 284 of the Statistical Abstract for 1894, where the average home price is given, and he averaged the five years, 1875-1879, giving you the 99.8 cents as the result, and then made the broad statement that it was as high now as then. I am going to read to the stenographer from that same table from which Mr. Horr took his prices for 1875-9, prices also for 1890 to '94, where he wound up with the broad statement that we are getting as much for wheat now as then. The figures as I read them are as follow:

1890	83.8	cents
1891	83.9	"
1892	62.4	"
1893	53.9	"
1894	49.1	"

Those were the home prices, and from the agricultural report copied in the Statistical Abstract. I pass the book to Mr. Horr.

MR. HORR: I have a better one, all bound.

MR. HARVEY: We are accused by Mr. Horr in this debate of finding fault with men and conditions for the reason, as he charges, that we seemingly delight to do so. And he contrasts against that the better disposition in man that loves to look upon things that are pleasant. He has touched a phase of human nature on which volumes might be written, and it is a hope of all

who take an active interest in the promotion of civilization that the time will come when there will be nothing but contentment and happiness on this earth. But, to reach that period, we must remove the obstacles in the way. I want to say to Mr. Horr that the argument he makes has been used in all ages to fortress and defend tyranny. It is an opiate intended to lull into repose the oppressed. It is an argument that appeals to man's desire for peace. There is one notable instance in this country when that argument was made, and the answer to it was the Declaration of Independence. (Applause.) Later the king issued an amnesty proclamation offering peace to those who would lay down their arms, and the insidious tongue told the people they were pessimists to further arraign the conditions under which they were living. The answer to that was Yorktown. You cannot deter brave men, who know their rights, and dare maintain them, by an argument that is intended to lure them from the subject to which they invite your intelligent analysis. Mr. Horr's inappropriate language consisted of words that might be addressed to slaves, but not to freemen.

Mr. Horr says that the Sauerbeck table is English prices. It is a price table that has attracted the attention of the world. It shows the decline in prices of all those articles that seek the world's market, such as our wheat and our cotton. The London price of wheat affects the price of our wheat on the Chicago market. In the official book we have been using here, from Washington, called "Coinage Laws Appendix and Statistics," there are three tables. One is the Sauerbeck table, one the Soetbeer table, and the other the Aldrich table. The Aldrich table is the one he refers to as containing 249 articles. It was made by a Senate committee of

which Senator Aldrich was chairman. He called to his aid principally gold-standard assistants. Unlike Sauerbeck, they were not free from a desire to make as good a showing as they possibly could for prices in the United States. When it is known that Edward Atkinson was one of the men who assisted in making it (the report so states), one can judge of the bias that enters into it. This man Atkinson recently said, in an article published over his signature in a Chicago newspaper, that the proper way to deal with a silver man is to hit him over the head with a club. (Applause.) This Aldrich report was made in 1891, when the men making it supposed prices had touched the lowest point they would possibly go. And yet it shows a decline in prices of thirty per cent below 1872 and 8 per cent below the price of 1860. I have arranged a table of comparison for the three price tables I have named, thus giving you a comparison of the Aldrich, Sauerbeck, and Soetbeer tables, and I now make it a part of the debate.

PRICE TABLES OF THE ALDRICH REPORT COMPARED WITH SAUERBECK AND SOETBEER TABLES AS GIVEN IN PART I. OF THE ALDRICH REPORT. THE PAGE NUMBERS GIVEN BELOW ALL ARE OF THE ALDRICH REPORT, WHICH AT THE PAGES GIVEN COPIES THE SAUERBECK AND SOETBEER TABLES.

Aldrich Report, Page 91.	Sauerbeck, Page 247.	Soetbeer. Hamburg and England— Average. Page 294.	Soetbeer, Hamburg, Page 295.
1850....102.3	1850.... 77	1851....100.21	1851.... 82.8
1860....100.0	1860.... 99	1860....120.98	1860....100.0
*1872....138.8	1872....109	1872....135.62	1872....112.1
1891.... 92.2	1891.... 72	1891....109.19	1891.... 90.3
1894....80 68	1894.... 63	1894.... 95.55	1894.... 79.0

NOTE —The last line (1894) is added by me, by deducting the percentage of decline since 1891, as shown by the Sauerbeck table, as heretofore published in this debate. The Aldrich report stops with 1891, while by this estimate I bring it down to date.

*Deducting 12 ½ per cent premium on gold in the United States in 1872, we have 121.46 as the gold index price, instead of 138.8.

The table gives the pages in the official book from Washington on which that table may be found. We thus see by all of these tables that prices are lower now than in 1850. These tables all prove the enormous purchasing power of money when exchanged for property, and the small amount of money property will buy when exchanged for money.

THE HUMAN-TOIL UNIT.

Mr. Horr has repeatedly called your attention in this debate to a new system of measuring property. It is a system that he calls the human-toil unit. It is a deceptive argument, and as near as I can trace its origin it originated with a man in Ohio who wrote a letter to Mr. Horr, in care of *The New York Tribune*. Mr. Horr read the letter, sat down at his table and wrote a reply to it, and I now read you from that reply. It was published in a *New York Tribune Weekly*, and afterward in making up *The Tribune Monthly* it was copied into that, and from that I read. (Applause.)

"I now come," says Mr. Horr, "to the real gist of Mr. Brown's letter. It will be found in his statement that a day's work may readily form the measuring unit of the medium of exchange; and by contraction he would call it a dollar. That will not do. It would lead to confusion. The word 'dollar' has now a well-defined meaning. What a dollar shall consist of is fixed by the laws of Congress. The word has been used so long to mean a certain amount of gold or silver that to make it also mean a day's work would give it a double meaning, which would confuse common, ordinary people."

Further on he says:

"Candidly, Mr. Brown, your entire system seems to me so absurd that I can hardly treat it soberly." (Applause.)

I now pass Mr. Horr's article to him. (Laughter and applause.)

It is ridiculous to an intelligent man to have this financial argument loaded down with a confusing proposition of the human-toil unit. Human toil sells its services for a medium of exchange which it can barter for the substance and necessities of life. And I can only reply to Mr. Horr's argument on that question in the language he used to Mr. Brown himself, that it is so absurd as not to be considered soberly. (Applause.)

The gold-standard men are constantly pointing to the gold dollar as being worth 100 cents as measured in itself. Of course it is. It is a self-evident proposition, as measured in itself, it is worth a hundred cents. What we want to consider is the exchangeable value of money with property, and the exchangeable value of property with money. And from these combined tables that are now a part of this debate you learn that lesson, and you learn it in a way that no confused argument that can be put into the controversy can affect you.

Mr. Horr: Mr. Harvey is at his old tricks, quoting one sentence from an article and assuming that that shows the gist of the whole. I have not had time to re-read my article, but I will agree if Brother Harvey will read the whole of it that he will get more financial sense into his head, if he will digest it, than he has ever had up to the present day. (Applause and laughter.)

I was writing in reply to a man who thought that we ought not to have either gold or silver, a man who believed, as my friend Harvey used to teach, only a little while ago—that every kind of money should be a piece of paper stamped by the government—and anybody that will read the article will see that he was not only a greenbacker of the old sort, but his theories were abso-

lutely so ridiculous that they were contemptible. What I said in reference to his theories being ridiculous, was not in reference to his measure of value at all. It was his whole attempt to substitute a paper dollar based on nothing with which to do the business of this country. That is where Harvey will land yet. The disease that he has never dies out. He hasn't reached the last stages of it. That is the trouble. What he wants and what these people are after is to destroy all values and to destroy all property and to put this nation on a socialistic and anarchistic basis. (Cries of "No! No!") That is right, I knew you would understand that.

MR. HARVEY: I submit right here there is not one scintilla in this debate that authorizes you to say that. (Applause.)

MR. HORR: I say there is one scintilla in it, and I say that up to date you have got applause from this audience, your part of it only, when your arguments have tended to show that you think the whole society of this country ought to be destroyed. (Cries of "No! No!") I know what I am talking about.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr—

MR. HORR: Well, never mind, don't bother.

BANKS AND BANKERS.

Now as to banks. Why is it that Mr. Harvey feels called upon to enter into a tirade against banks, and to indulge in such a torrent of abuse against bankers?

The picture that he drew of our country is a sad one. It would indeed be very sad if it were true. I can hardly conceive of a greater, more wicked misrepresentation of facts than have crept into the talk he has given us up to the present moment. Why do you keep insisting that this country hasn't anything left? That all we have

here in this world, in the United States I mean, we owe to foreigners? Why do you try to prove to the people of the country that we are on the brink of a precipice—he tells us, just hanging over—future ruin. Why, look at the facts! No nation on the face of the earth, I don't care what one you name, has been as prosperous as the United States of America since 1873. Look at the railroads we have built within the last twenty years; look at the enormous amount of savings which have accumulated in the various banking and loan institutions of this country; look at the new farms which have been opened, at the millions of new homes which have been built and beautified. I have before stated that I am not familiar with the Old World, but I do know something about my own country. As far as the United States are concerned, I know he is mistaken. Now I will admit that there are, no doubt, too many bad people in the world. That ought to make you happy. But there are also a large number who are true and honest and good. Some men who accumulate property and have money to loan are grasping and mean, but large numbers of them are in all things quite decent people. A man may be a banker and not at the same time be a scamp. Men may occasionally invest their money in bonds and mortgages and not become scoundrels by so doing. A man may even be an honest believer in monometallism and not be either a thief or a robber. (Applause and laughter.) Indeed a man may even believe that silver has had its day and should never again be used as standard money; he may believe that honestly, though Mr. Harvey may differ from him. Though I may not even agree with him, yet he may be just as clear-headed, just as good a friend of humanity, as either of us. "With charity for all, with malice toward none,"

we should strive to convince those who differ with us of the error of their ways, but never lose sight of the fact that we may be in the wrong and they may be in the right.

Banks are a natural outgrowth of civilization. They have been continually improved to meet the growing business of the world. No nation can economically do its business without the aid of banks. When well managed they bless all the people in any and every community where they are located. (Applause.) They add business power to every dollar of the standard money in existence. They make a dollar in gold do more than twenty dollars used to do.

The commerce of the world—all of it—is an exchange of commodities. When money enters into the transaction it performs one or both of two objects. It always is used as the measure of value; it is sometimes also used as the medium of exchange.

In civilized countries it is seldom used as a circulating medium. By the aid of banks exchanges are made with the use of very little actual money.

In the business of the United States less than five per cent of the exchanges are made in money. The balance is done with checks, drafts, bills of exchange, shipping receipts, promissory notes, and every other conceivable kind of credit, and always with very little money.

I spent a day in the clearing house in the City of New York, and saw them settle in three hours $119,000,000 of business, and they used less than five per cent of the amount in actual cash. Their system is so complete that their balances were paid with certificates of the United States sub-treasury or with very large bills, and hence there was little counting of money. What a few years ago would have taken an army of men, and

long, long days of work, was accomplished by this system of banking and bookkeeping in a few hours.

THE CREDIT SYSTEM.

MR. HARVEY: I was discussing at the last session the banking system and the short supply of money to supply the normal demand for business. I showed you the normal supply required, and to show you the difference between having the money in existence and having the banks supply it, with their credit system, I here hand the stenographer a table of failures as it appears in the January number, 1895, of Dun's Review, to be copied and inserted at this point of the debate.

FAILURES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR THIRTY-EIGHT YEARS.

Year.	Failures.	Amount of Liabilities.	Year.	Failures.	Amount of Liabilities.
1857	4,932	$291,750,000	1876	9,092	$191,117,000
1858	4,225	95,749,000	1877	8,872	190,669,936
1859	3,913	64,394,000	1878	10,478	234,383,132
1860	3,675	79,807,000	1879	6,658	98,149,053
1861	6,993	207,210,000	1880	4,735	65,752,000
1862	1,652	23,049,000	1881	5,582	81,155,932
1863	495	7,899,900	1882	6,738	101,547,564
1864	520	8,579,000	1883	9,184	172,874,172
1865	530	17,625,000	1884	10,968	226,343,427
1866	1,505	53,783,000	1885	10,637	124,220,321
1867	2,780	96,666,000	1886	9,834	114,644,119
1868	2,608	63,694,000	1887	9,634	167,560,944
1869	2,799	75,054,054	1888	10,679	123,829,973
1870	3,546	88,242,000	1889	10,882	148,784,337
1871	2,915	85,252,000	1890	10,907	189,856,964
1872	4,069	121,056,000	1891	12,273	189,868,638
1873	5,183	228,499,900	1892	10,344	114,044,167
1874	5,830	155,239,000	1893	15,242	346,779,889
1875	7,740	201,000,000	1894	13,885	172,992,856

It shows that during the years of the war, when there was plenty of money, and the total volume was confined to what was known as the Union side of the contro-

versy, making about $40 per capita, the number of business failures was reduced to a minimum.

See, as you look at it, how the contraction of the currency, beginning in 1866, increased the failures. Follow it now along down the years to 1894, and note its ravages as demonetization and bank credit, with their terrible tax on the people, were substituted for real money. Notice the failures prior to 1862, when bank credit was supplying the people with money. Look at its terrible ravages in the last ten years; 115,000 business concerns have gone into bankruptcy. How is it now? At least that many more are hanging on by their eyebrows. This is the reward of human energy and thrift. I do not mean to say that all these failures are to be attributed to this cause, but I do mean to say, that the credit system of money, with its tax of $200,000,000 annually, will account for every dollar involved in those failures. If we had more real money instead of bank-credit money, there would be comparatively few debts and few failures.

You owe it to yourselves and to civilization to get rid of this bank-credit money, and substitute for it real money. (Applause.) The supply of money should be equal to the demand, the same as wheat, corn, meat, or any other property. It is in your power to do it. Will you do your own thinking for yourselves, or will you let a selfish interest do your thinking for you? If you will do your own thinking, we will have a republic here that will open up opportunities to all and give us time to study the question: What are we here on this earth for?

To master the intricacies of the science of money is not difficult. It is as simple as the law of architecture, and fewer principles are involved in it than in the construction of a building.

THE NECESSITY FOR MONEY.

The first lesson to learn is the necessity for money. Civilization is so constructed as to make it a necessity. Our social fabric, by which our vocations are classified, make of it a medium of exchange and necessity.

A suicide was committed in this city the other day by a woman. Her husband was out of work and had no money. She had gone without anything to eat for two days. She had tramped the city looking for work herself, and as night came on she was two miles from home. She could not ride on a street car for the want of five cents. She tried to beg; it, too, was a failure. She finally reached home, where all was cheerless. She was in a city of nearly 2,000,000 people, but she was as desolate as if she had been in the middle of the Great Sahara Desert.

A little money would have brought food, health, hope and happiness, but she did not have it. Her husband passed through the room. She asked him if he had any money. He had not. A moment later and she was dead; dead by her own hands.

Poverty causes intemperate drinking and crime. The want of money often destroys character in both man and woman. The scarcity of money is the principal cause of their poverty.

You can not say, if there were more money, the same people would be without it, for to increase the supply of anything is to cheapen it and bring it into more common use. This applies to money, the same as it does to wheat, corn, bicycles, or anything else. (Applause.)

To relieve the demand, make money no more desirable than other property, to take that one great strain from the human mind, and turn it in a higher and nobler direction, is the true study of economy and states-

manship. It is not a craze for money that civilization needs, but a craze for building up nice homes; for building up character; for studying the universe in which we find ourselves; and in advancing the destiny of the human race. This we may do if we will but break the influence of this money power. The monopoly of it has encouraged all forms of monopoly, and when we have destroyed this influence, we shall be more competent to judge other questions that are sustained by the cultivation of a selfish principle. We shall have set the example of liberality and humanity, and we shall march rapidly to a new era in the world's history.

I wish to make a part of this debate also a table that you will find in volume 2 of the Publications of the American Statistical Association of 1890 and '91, pages 186 to 194, giving the total business population of the United States and the total number of business firms dropping out of business and the number added to business. I now make it a part of the debate to be inserted at this point.

BUSINESS FAILURES.

Albert C. Stevens, in a paper entitled "The Commercial Death Rate," (Vol. 2 of Publications of the American Statistical Association, 1890-91, pages 186 to 194) sums up the result of his investigations on the question of business failures (based on census and Bradstreet reports) as follows:

Calendar Year.	Total Business Population in United States.	Total Number Dropping out Each Year.	Net Total Number Added Each Year.
1879	703,000	100,000	......
1880	733,000	110,000	30,000
1881	780,000	110,000	47,000
1882	820,000	105,000	40,000
1883	855,000	110,000	35,000
1884	875,000	120,000	20,000
1885	890,000	145,000	15,000
1886	920,000	165,000	30,000
1887	933,000	170,000	13,000
1888	955,000	178,000	22,000
1889	978,000	209,000	23,000
1890	989,000	229,000	11,000

EFFECTS OF FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

I now desire to call your attention to the effects of the financial and kindred legislation that has been encouraged by the same selfish interests upon the country in the years since that legislation.

Bradstreet's Publication for July 20, 1895, shows that on June 30 ninety-four receivers were operating 156 railways in this country, representing about 39,000 miles of railway. It shows that during the last twelve months 46 railroads, representing 6,723 miles, have passed out of the hands of receivers by foreclosures.

I now read you from page 262 of the February number, 1895, of *Lippincott's Magazine* in a comparative review of the census of 1880 with that of 1890:

"In forty-seven states and territories the number owning farms increased 158,951 and the number of tenant farmers increased 599,337. In 1880, 25.62 per cent of the farms were cultivated by tenants; in 1890, 34.13 per cent of the farms were hired."

I refer to this because Mr. Horr used some detached statements concerning Minnesota farms the other day, which must be regarded as very incomplete. I have read you a comparison of the tables for the whole United States. (Applause.)

MR. HORR: So did I follow it with the whole.

MR. HARVEY: I did not so understand it.

MR. HORR: Well, you did not read what I said then. Did not pay attention. I gave the whole.

MR. HARVEY: Did you have your book here, the book you read from?

MR. HORR: I don't remember about that.

MR. HARVEY: You have not been having the books here.

Mr. Horr: Why, the bulk of the books I can't get, because you have got them out of the library and keep them. I have never been able to get them. (Applause and laughter.)

Mr. Harvey: There are eight or ten public libraries in this city, all having the books that we are using in this debate. (Applause.) And the books that I have had here have been on this table for Mr. Horr's use if he wanted them. No such subterfuge as that will save the gentleman from criticism for making quotations in this debate, from authorities which he has not produced here for our inspection. (Applause.)

I now read you, Mr. Horr, on this subject from the Census Bulletin of the census of 1890, now in my hand. I read you this paragraph:

"New York is the congested part of a large urban region, and a greater New York may more fairly be taken into consideration. In New York City and the nine counties in New York State and New Jersey that are neighboring to that city, 81.54 per cent of the home families are tenants."

Now as to your City of New York:

"The highest degree of city home tenancy is in New York and is represented by 93.67 per cent."

Ninety-three and sixty-seven hundredths per cent of the families in your city are tenants.

Mr. Horr: I have this to say in reference to my conduct of this debate without bringing in my books, and I allude to that reminding you of the gusto for which Brother Harvey is so peculiar, with which he says, "I now pass the book over to Mr. Horr," when he knows that it is impossible for me during the excitement of the debate to examine and look into the merits of the book or his references. The only times when I have done it I have caught him in misquoting the book, and made him own it right here before the audience.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr, that is not true.

Mr. Horr: The audience knows whether that is true or not.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr, the record of the debate will show it.

Mr. Horr: Well, it will show it. I have been in the business of debating a good deal in my life, and when a man states the authority as I have done, and gives the place and page, I take it for granted that he is honest and that he has quoted the book correctly—and I would not consider it respectful to myself to be constantly demanding that the other side should read it all over to see if I were right. I am in the habit of quoting accurately, but I sometimes make a mistake. I differ from the boy "Coin" in one respect,—if you catch him at it, instead of owning it he denies it, and that isn't all,—he tells a "whopper" (laughter) in order to explain how he got out of it. (Laughter.) That is not my method. Now look: I charged my friend Harvey, two or three times, with tending toward the old notions of greenbackism and with being a real believer in that ridiculous nonsense, fiat money. He doesn't deny it.

Mr. Harvey: I do deny it.

Mr. Horr: You did not and you have not. You simply say "there is nothing in this debate from which you have a right to infer anything of the kind." I did not infer it from the debate, I inferred it from his methods of arguing that old craze of fiat money. I have had large experience with it, you know, and when I see the symptoms I can detect the disease. (Laughter.) They are not symptoms that are visible to a person who has not been in the practice; I have been in the practice and I can go right out around in this audience now and pick them out by the score over there. (Long continued applause and laughter.)

CONDUCTING COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS.

But I must return to the question of banks. To a man accustomed to doing business at the present time the present methods of conducting commercial transactions is readily understood. That the quantity of gold in the world has not increased as fast as the business of the world has increased, I admit. But it does not take as much standard money to do the same amount of business to-day as it formerly did. Human ingenuity has devised methods so that one hundred dollars in gold will do the same work that more than two thousand dollars used to do. Hence Mr. Harvey's contention, that the quantity of the standard money alone determines its value, is incorrect. This increased power of gold, which enables one dollar to do the work that twenty or more dollars used to do, diminishes the actual demand for the metal itself, and hence prevents the burden he talks so much about being anything like in proportion to the amount of the business done in the world. Ninety-five per cent of the entire business in this country is done without the exchange of a dollar of currency. But it is all done on a gold basis with a gold measure for value. While the gold is the measure of values, the business is done by using all kinds of credit as a substitute for the money itself.

MONEY AS A STREAM OF WATER.

It is true that, all other things being equal, the quantity of water in a running stream would measure its value as a power to be used to aid man in the production of commodities. Yet the same quantity of water turning an old-fashioned under-shot wheel will not compare in its benefits with the power obtained from the same quantity of water when mills are located along

the bank of the stream at successive falls, and the same water is used over and over again, with turbine wheels which take the place of the under-shot, and thus increase the power in every mill, obtained from using the same water. Thus it is that the work which can be done with the same amount of gold is enormously increased by our new methods of bookkeeping and banking. All this is for the benefit of the world, and Mr. Harvey, true to his impulses, immediately commences to abuse anything that helps anybody. Go into any community in the entire United States; and you will find that the bankers range with the very best men in that community for good business ability and uprightness of character. They have the confidence of the decent men in amost every city and village in the United States. I know, there may be once in a while a wicked man who does banking for a business. You will find, once in a while, a preacher who forgets his sacred calling, and is guilty of bad conduct. But a man who will undertake to vilify the whole class just on account of that one sample, is in bad business. Once in a while you will find a mother that will go back on her own child. But what kind of a state of mind is that man in who, on that account, will denounce all the mothers of the land as being unnatural and cruel to their offspring? This whole system of abusing everything that helps to build up a community is what I enter my protest against here and now.

But I now come to the keynote of Brother Harvey's entire system. He bases his new philosophy entirely upon the theory that the people of the world are mostly in debt. You won't deny that (turning to Mr. Harvey). It does not occur to him that the debtors and creditors, when you speak of sums of indebtedness, are always

precisely the same. But the number of the debtors and creditors differ very greatly in all civilized and uncivilized countries. His whole effort seems to be to prove that everybody is in debt, and that the legislation of the world should all be directed so as to relieve the debtor.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr compares our money to a stream of water and to the utilization of that water in the manner in which he illustrated it. I want to make another comparison to put alongside Mr. Horr's illustration: Money is a stream. Suppose that along that stream manufactories have been erected, and all have adjusted themselves to the quantity of water, that life-giving fluid that is flowing by them, and suddenly one-half of that water is taken out of the stream, what is the effect? (Applause.) That is the proper illustration to use in this discussion in the demonetization of silver. (Applause.) Let me draw another illustration from the gentleman's figure: Suppose we were by laws to give rights to men living along the banks of that stream of water, to store it away, draw it out and put it in great reservoirs, and rent it to the manufactories and the business houses along that stream where business men have adjusted themselves to the use of it, requiring them to pay a toll for the use of that water—then you would have our present banking system. (Applause.)

STATISTICS OF SO-CALLED PROSPEROUS YEARS.

I desire to make a part of the record in this debate a table in volume 3, American Statistical Association Publications, page 359; it gives the number of homicides in the whole United States in the decade from 1882 to 1891, as compiled by *The Chicago Tribune* and receiving the endorsement of this Statistical Association Publications:

Year.	Murders.	Year.	Murders.
1882	1,467	1887	2,335
1883	1,697	1888	2,184
1884	1,465	1889	3,567
1885	1,808	1890	4,290
1886	1,499	1891	5,906

This table of Mr. Cook's cannot be explained by an increase in immigration; nor the increase in crimes, insanity and suicides be attributed to immigration, as will be seen by the following table. I now introduce a table showing the number of immigrants coming to this country the same number of years as a part of this debate:

Year.	Immigrants.	Year.	Immigrants.
1882	788,992	1888	546,889
1883	603,322	1889	444,427
1884	518,592	1890	455,302
1885	395,346	1891	560,319
1886	334,203	1892	623,084
1887	490,109	1893	502,927
		1894	314,467

We frequently hear people talk about our having had prosperous times covered by the above dates. It will be well for those who sincerely wish to arrive at a correct conclusion, and who are of too high an order of intelligence to be misled by party prejudice, to study these statistics bearing on the decline of civilization, and note the period that has brought it upon us.

I wrote a letter the other day to the Census Bureau at Washington, asking for official information showing number of criminals, the insane and suicides for 1880 and 1890, as shown by the census. I now read you the reply, and will pass the letter to Mr. Horr.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS DIVISION.
WASHINGTON, July 6, 1895.

"DEAR SIR:—Referring to yours of recent date, asking to be furnished various information from this office, I beg to say that the census is not in possession of data

later than those obtained at the census of 1890. Below will be found a statement of the items desired for the years 1880 and 1890. You will find in the leading public libraries reports for earlier censuses, from which it will be more satisfactory for you to make such extracts as you may see fit:

Number of inmates in penitentiaries, 1880	35,538
" " " " " 1890	45,233
Prisoners in county jails, 1880	12,691
" " " " 1890	19,538
Number of insane in institutions, 1880	41,177
" " " " " 1890	74,028
Number of suicides reported, 1880	2,511
" " " " 1890	3,932

These figures, as you understand, are simply the number of convicts in penitentiaries, and do not include the prisoners found in various other places, and for the insane the figures are those in institutions, not the total number reported insane June 1, 1890.

"Yours respectfully,
GEO. S. DONNELL,
Chief of Division.

TO MR. W. H. HARVEY,
134 Monroe St.,
Chicago, Ill."

The Chicago Tribune of June 30, 1895, speaking of the increased suicides, said editorially:

"The lamentable occurrence suggests a look at the statistics of suicide, and a question as to the cause of its greater frequency now as compared with a few years ago. The following totals for the United States are of startling interest in this connection:

Year.	Suicides.	Year.	Suicides.
1889	2,224	1892	3,360
1890	2,640	1893	4,486
1891	3,331	1894	4,912

"And the number reported during the first six months of this year, lacking two days, is 2,756, or considerably more than 50 per cent of the number for the whole of 1894, while the average for July and August is always

greater than for other months, so that 1895 may be expected to far surpass 1894 in the number of suicides. There is thus an almost steady augment in the number, which increases much faster than the population."

The Chicago *Inter Ocean* in an editorial of the 12th instant said:

"False representations of prosperity are only less dangerous than false representations of adversity. A knowledge of the truth is as essential to success in trade as to progress in morals. A boom predicted upon a false assumption of industrial resources soon collapses. And, in plain truth, there are no reliable indications of any speedy return to such prosperity as obtained prior to the political and financial disaster of 1892."

The *Inter Ocean* then proceeded to quote some prominent men on the present status; among them, Marshall Field. They quoted Marshall Field as saying:

"Business may have improved, but those interested in booming things evidently are trying to make them out as better than they are."

LESSON FROM FALLING PRICES.

Will not this lesson of the falling prices of property, and the rising prices of money, concurrent with a loss of wealth among the property-owners and wage-earners, producing as it certainly does this increase in crime, insanity and suicide, arrest your attention? You are humble citizens of a republic, and yet the humblest among you are endowed with common sense, the safest bulwark of a republic against the sophistries that have brought ruin to all previous republics, and that is now bringing ruin to us.

On this subject I want to say right here that Mr. Horr has attempted to divert your minds from an examination of the condition of this country as it is now, and as I am now spreading it upon the pages of this de-

bate, advising you that it is more pleasant to look upon sweet things. Again, in answer to that, I want to say that history tells you that all republics have fallen. It has been the hope of mankind that one would be erected that would be permanent. That is what we want to do in this country, but you will never have a permanent republic in this country until we teach ourselves to diagnose the national disease. If your child is sick and you turn your eyes away from its disease, and tell it, in the language of Mr. Horr, to eat candy, to look upon sweet things, your child may die, but if you examine as to what is the matter, send for a doctor, do what is necessary, you may save the life of your child. Now that is all that we are trying to do in this discussion. We love the sweet things of life as much as any man, and we would have them, and have them permanently, for civilization in the United States. Do not let the United States as a republic pass into the hands of selfish men to whom monarchy becomes a necessity. The moment they have deprived you by a false money measurement of your property, the people generally of their property, aggregating to themselves, to the few, the property, then monarchy becomes a necessity. And that is the way all republics have become monarchies (applause) when that condition has arisen. (Applause.)

WHY PEOPLE BECOME RESTLESS.

The masses become restless. Why? Because they have become poor; because they have been deprived of the necessaries of life. They become restless, then comes crime, as I am now giving you from the statistics in this debate. Then come poverty and suicide and insanity. The country goes morally and politically crazy. Then comes the necessity for martial law; then comes the necessity for Gatling guns and repeating rifles, for

an increase of the police, and for a standing army. In the last three weeks, and for the first time in the history of the United States, a general order has gone from the President of the United States, to the commander of the army, laying down rules for governing the United States army in the control of mobs and riots. (Applause.) We are trending to monarchy, and it is wrong for Mr. Horr or any other man to shut his eyes to this defect in our civilization that I am now pointing out. (Applause.) If you would save liberty in this land, if you would preserve this, the United States, from the fate of Europe, it is your duty to do it, and it should become your pleasure to do it, and to do it you will act like intelligent men and you will act like freemen. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: I couldn't stop him because he was enjoying himself so well. He gets so much comfort out of denouncing the human race that I was letting him revel in his glory.

This little table that he handed over to me—where is it, Brother Harvey?—that account of failures. Where are the books that you made it up from?

Mr. Harvey: Here they are.

Mr. Horr: I don't want to see them.

(Mr. Harvey throws numerous books over to Mr. Horr.)

Mr. Horr: Yes, right there. That is right. (Long continued applause.) You are sure they are accurate? You think they are? You are satisfied they are? You did your best, anyhow?

Mr. Harvey: If Dun and Bradstreet are accurate they are accurate.

FAILURES AND PANICS.

Mr. Horr: Glancing at them, I find tnat this reports

the failures of 1857 as compared with the failures of 1893—that is they report the failures of both those years; and I make the comparison. 1857 was a year of fearful panic. I lived during those years. I suffered during those years. I know something of the trouble that spread over this nation then. We then had, according to my friend Harvey, a double standard. We had another bad failure in 1893, which he attributes to our being on the gold standard. I am not going to take the time in this debate to tell you what really led up to that panic in 1893, but one factor that entered into the panic of 1893 was the fear of the business men of this country and the world that our nation was going to be given over to a class of men that were shouting for free silver. That was one great trouble. In his immense effort in his last speech to make out that the country was going to ruin he recites the suicides and diseases that are incident to the human family at this time. But before I get through I must finish the failures of 1857. That table of his shows that they amounted to $291,750,000 or $10 per capita. That was under your double standard. In 1883, when we were under the gold standard, the failures were $346,779,000—that is, $5.25 per capita. (Applause.) They were just about double in 1857 what they were in 1893.

But now to go back. Yesterday, in his vivid description of what we are doing under this crushing money power, he could not express himself until he compared the story of the crucifixion of our Saviour, and laid that to the money power of that day. He forgot that the only man that betrayed our Saviour was Judas Iscariot, the only silver man of the entire tribe (applause), and what is remarkable, he insisted on a ratio of thirty to one. (Laughter and continued applause.)

Now he takes up my illustration of the running water and wants me to tell what would happen if they took away one-half of the water from the fount of a stream and so let only half of it run down. If they should do that, unless there was plenty of water in the stream after they took the half, it would make trouble. But if they could spare half and still have enough to do all the business of the country, it wouldn't make one particle of difference, not one particle. And before I get through I am going to convince Mr. Harvey so that he will leave the room perfectly overwhelmed (laughter and applause) with the truth of my proposition. (Laughter and applause.)

CREDITORS AND DEBTORS.

Now my idea of life is entirely different from his. I think that credit is a good thing, and we cannot have a creditor without there is a debtor. Mr. Harvey, you are not the first person I have seen in the world who has conceived the idea that everything is wrong in the world on account of some one thing. I sometimes call such men cranks. (Laughter.) You will not be offended when I give the full definition of "crank." I don't use it for the purpose of being offensive. A crank is a man who has been thinking and brooding over some one thing until he twists everything in the universe so as to make it tally with his theory about that one thing, and then forgets all the other circumstances of life.

It is on this account that Mr. Harvey talks constantly about the unlimited demand for money when free coinage is given to silver. Why, there is no such thing in the world as an unlimited demand for anything. He knows it. There is a limit to all demands for every kind of property—for everything in this world of ours.

I wonder, Brother Harvey, why instead of devoting

yourself to business you haven't before now established a school for the education of doctors. From your speech this morning on insanity, etc., you have a clear-cut idea about physicians, and if you will apply your method of arguing you will open such a school to-morrow. The only way is to start out with the proposition that the whole human race is sick (laughter); that we are all subject to disease; that there isn't a single person on the face of the earth who hasn't some ache and some pain. Now, if there is any unlimited demand for anything on the face of the earth it is something that will relieve people from feeling badly. Doctors are the things! Consequently in order to carry out your theory it would become necessary to magnify the disease of the people, make them think that every little ache is a disease that threatens life, and then you would get an unlimited demand for doctors. Now in order to carry out just that theory, my friend Harvey has magnified the debts of the people of this country. He does not recollect that the business of the world is more done upon credit than all other things combined. When you strike down the credit of the world you bring trouble. In order to reach his unlimited demand for money, he starts out with the proposition that the entire human race are debtors, and consequently the only use for money, the only legitimate use, is to pay debts.

MR. HARVEY: As to the unlimited demand for money—I think all of the reasonable citizens in the United States will agree with me that there is, comparatively speaking, an unlimited demand for money in this country; that we cannot only use what we have but that we could use several times as much, and that most men would still be asking for more. The history of all countries is, the more money they have the more prosperous they are—provided it is good money. And silver money,

as shown by all these tables you will study in this debate, is a stable money, holding an exchangeable value for long periods of years with property. (Applause.) Mr. Horr compares the failures in 1857 with 1893. The table that I presented is to teach this: that under the bank-credit system we have always had panics and always shall have. Now the unfairness of Mr. Horr's comparison is this: bimetallic prices are higher than single-standard prices. There was no trouble about the measurement of values in 1857, it was based upon both gold and silver. There was a stable measurement of values, and the panic did not come about by reason of a disproportionate or radical change taking place in the comparative value of money with property. They are virtually stable. The panic of 1857 came about by reason of the bank-credit system. A study of the table that I put in this debate will justify it.

Now Mr. Horr says that I said in "Coin's Financial School" that there were $40,000,000,000 of debts in the United States, about. This debate is coming to a close virtually to-day, because on Monday I shall speak exclusively upon the independent action of the United States, and have not room in the debate now to answer in detail that question Mr. Horr has been putting to me several times in this debate. I am going to answer you now sufficiently in this way. I hand you the *Bankers' Magazine* issued in New York City, which gives the long-time debts in this country. I skip all of the long-time debts connected with national banks, etc., and read you five items.

State and municipal bonds	$1,135,000,000
Railroad bonds the estimated amount in 1895	5,600,000,000
Mortgaged street railroads, business corporations and business property	5,000,000,000
Farm and home mortgages	2,500,000,000
Loans and discounts, banks, savings banks, and trust companies	4,140,000,000

You have there, Mr. Horr, in the neighborhood of $15,000,000,000 of debts, and including loans by banks it is $19,000,000,000. I pass you the book.

Now I will tell you how I get the balance of the $40,000,000,000. After this debate is over I will give it to you in detail if you want it, but I get at it in this way. A question was asked you the other day in this debate concerning the debts, and in your answer you said this—I now quote from you—

"The great bulk of debts in this country are not over three months old. The debts that run only ninety days are the great mass of the debts paid in every civilized nation. The debts that run over a year are largely small in number, while the debts that run over five years are still very much smaller."

Now I have shown you $15,000,000,000 long-time debts (applause), and as you say that the long-time debts are very much smaller than the great bulk of debts, you can easily get the balance of your $40,000,000,000.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

I want to say something in this debate on the cost of production, because it has been enlarged upon by Mr. Horr. He bases falling prices upon improved facilities. My claim is that improved facilities do not lower the price of such products. It is the supply produced and the demand for it that regulates the price of such products. Let us make this plain.

Suppose a widow, owning a farm, receives the voluntary assistance of her neighbors to raise and harvest her wheat crop. Will her wheat be worth any less than the price fixed by the quantity of wheat in existence known to the traders, and the estimated demand for it? No.

If all the corn crop in the United States were de-

stroyed except the crop in Iowa, would the Iowa corn price be governed by the cost of production or the relative supply and demand for corn? We know it would advance heavily under the demand that would exist as compared with the supply.

Suppose there were a demand in the United States for 1,000,000 laborers, and there were only 500,000 laborers, one half as many as needed. There would be a stiff and rapid advance in the price of labor. The demand would be greater than the supply.

The quantity of wheat in the world and the demand for it fixes the price of wheat in the markets of the world, and not the cost of production.

If improved facilities, however, cause a larger number of people to seek wheat-raising as a vocation, and in that way an over-supply of wheat is produced, the price of wheat will fall on account of the supply being greater than the demand. Thus supply, when greater than the demand, will bring prices down; and, when demand is greater than the supply, prices will go up. The cost of the product has nothing to do with it. A man may produce an ounce of gold for ten cents that is worth twenty dollars. The fact that it cost him ten cents does not make it worth less than twenty dollars.

But suppose it be said that improved facilities always result in lower prices. The answer is this:

Improved facilities are being applied to all products, including gold and silver. And if it increases production alike, both in the thing to be measured and the product in which they are measured, the exchangeable value of the two would remain substantially unchanged. (Applause.) This was illustrated prior to 1873. Improved facilities were producing money substance—silver and gold—a little faster than things to be measured

in them. Hence rising prices. Then we began destroying one-half the money-measuring substance. The substance in which other things were to be valued became proportionately less than the things to be measured in it. This increased the demand for this money-measuring substance by proportionately decreasing the supply. It exchanged for more of other things. This meant falling prices. It (gold) was rising in exchangeable value.

So, here, too, we see that supply and demand and not cost of production regulates values. Right here let me say:

Money has a price as well as property. The price of money is what you have to give for it in property, and the price of property is what you have to give for it in money. Supply and demand affects one the same as it does the other.

So that before 1873, when silver and gold both made up our stock of primary money, improved facilities were increasing their supply proportionately with other things. From 1851 to 1873—twenty-two years—there was a period of rapid growth in improved facilities, and yet they did not produce a fall in prices, as claimed for them now. Why? Because improved facilities were also at work in creating money.

During this period the supply of money was gradually gaining on aggregate production of other property, hence a rise in prices. As it gained, civilization responded with energy and alacrity to its vitalizing influence. It (money) was commercial blood, and the body grew. In the very face of improved facilities and a lower cost of production, prices were advancing. It is the relative proportion of primary money to property that fixes what is called price, and not the cost of production of either the money or the property. The fall

in prices in the twenty-two years since 1873 cannot, therefore, be attributed to improved facilities.

Mr. Horr: I desire to say that before we complete the debate to-day I will give my friend Harvey due notice that his table on debts will receive all the attention that he will like to have given to it, and I will then reconcile my statement entirely that I made here the other day with the facts in the case. I will show that it has no reference at all to the debts that he gives and they cannot be included in the $40,000,000,000 that he made the people of the United States owe.

But just now, during this talk of mine, I want to call the attention of the country to the fact that Mr. Harvey, true to the doctrines generally taught by his school, is mystified because he takes it for granted that the business of a country entirely depends upon the amount per capita of the circulating medium. He insists that if you shrink that you ruin the business in the country.

There are a large number of men who believe that doctrine, but no more transparent humbug was ever taught the people of this or any other country.

PER CAPITA CIRCULATION OF LEADING NATIONS.

I have in my hand a table showing the per capita circulation of the currency of all the leading nations of the world. I shall make it a portion of my talk and have it printed for the benefit of the readers of this debate. It is as follows:

France has $36.81 to each inhabitant;
The United Kingdom (Great Britain and Ireland) $20.44;
Germany has $18.56;
The United States $26.02;
Belgium $26.70;
Australia $26.05;

The Netherlands $24.34:

In China with a population of 402,700,000 the per capita circulation is but $1.80, all silver;

Roumania has $4.60;

Servia $4.27;

Sweden $2.71:

Turkey $2.39;

Central American States $3.78;

Japan $4;

India, with a population of 287,200,000, has $3.44;

Hayti $4.90;

Portugal $21.06;

Egypt $19.85;

The South American States $9.67

Canada $10;

Cuba $12.31;

Italy $9.79;

Switzerland $14.48;

Greece $12.22;

Spain $17.12;

Austria-Hungary $9.59:

Norway $6.60;

Denmark 11.72;

And Russia, with a population of 124,000,000, has $8.17 to each inhabitant.

I now call attention to a few facts. France has a very large per capita circulation, $36.81 to each inhabitant; but France has no such system of universal banking as has Great Britain. She does a large proportion of her transactions by the use of currency instead of checks.

Great Britain has only $20.44 per capita, and business is fully as readily done in Great Britain as it is in France, because in every nook and corner of Great Britain there is a bank which does all the clearing for the little neighborhood where it is located, and consequently they do not need the amount of money to do business with that they use in France.

Germany only has $18.56, and the greatest writer in Germany to-day, one of the greatest, a professor in one of her highest universities, states this fact, that Germany is crippled because she has not the banking facilities that Great Britain has, and says that until she learns to utilize the modern system of accounts and banks she will never learn the great power of a small amount of currency to do a large amount of business.

We have in this country $26.02 per capita. We have banks, too, scattered all over the United States, and money is a plethora in this country to-day. There are hundreds of millions of dollars lying idle, simply because there is nobody to use it. Did you know that? Why, my friend Harvey and all of you men who think that way as usual get the cart before the horse. It is not an abundance of money that makes business active; it is business that makes money active in this world of ours. (Applause.) And until you can comprehend that point, Brother Harvey, you will never understand this financial question at all. (Laughter.)

Sweden has only $2.71 per capita, and yet so complete are her internal arrangements that we hear no complaint of lack of funds in Sweden.

Canada has only $10 per capita, but Canada has an elegant banking system—no better, I believe, on the face of the earth than the Canadian system of utilizing banks.

Switzerland, one of the most prosperous little nations on the face of the globe, has only $14.48, about half as much as this country has.

Norway has only $6.60.

Russia, with a population of 124,000,000, has only $8.17. The ratio of money to the population proves nothing. What we need in the United States is good

wages for work, steady employment for our men, and we have got money enough to do twice the business we are doing to-day. (Applause.)

He carries the idea that the banks are constantly fleecing the people and that they have their harvest when the people are in distress. Why, there never was a greater fallacy taught to the American people. Bankers never make money when money is scarce, never make money in a panic, never make a great deal of money when interest is high. Bankers make their money when business is active, when interest is low, when their deposits are all the while increasing, when the people have confidence and there is something to loan. He upbraided the banks, because they have loaned part of their deposits and made interest on them.

Why, a bank—the first great effect it produces in a community is to set the money to being used a second time. The great bulk of the money of this country is used that could not be used at all under the old system without banks. Men keep it in their drawers, in their pockets, in their tills, have to keep it for emergencies. Now they deposit it in the bank.

He seems to think the bank does nothing but just gobble interest. The banks pay interest to depositors in most instances, in all savings-bank instances, and they make the money of depositors earn an enormous sum, millions upon millions each year, that they would never get a cent for but for the banks investing it and paying them interest on these deposits. They can't pay interest on deposits if they don't get some interest themselves. (Applause.)

MR. HARVEY: At the conclusion of this debate Mr. Horr and I have 2,500 words each at our disposal to write at our leisure within seven days after the debate,

to sum up the debate, and anything in Mr. Horr's arguments that I do not reply to to-day I will attend to in that summary, because there is only a short time left to us, and I want to answer some matters that have been introduced into this debate at the earlier stages.

INCREASE OF WAGES.

I want to speak a few moments on the proposition that wages have increased.

Laborers are of two classes. One class is the kind that produce something with their labor and depend on selling what they produce to receive pay for their labor. Under this class come all our farmers. If one of them produces with his labor 100 bushels of wheat and gets $50 for it, then $50 is the price of his labor. But if he sells the 100 bushels of wheat for $100, then he has received double the pay he did formerly.

Under this head also come the village tanner, the cobbler and tens of thousands of mechanics and others who depend on payment for their labor through the sale of what they make and produce. The effect of the gold standard on this class is manifest.

The other class is what is generally known as wage-earners; these are men who sell their labor direct to others for money. In considering the effect of the gold standard on this class, it should be divided into two groups.

The first: Unorganized labor.

Under this head come all persons not belonging to labor unions—in other words, unorganized labor. This group covers store clerks, office help, and all other classes that are not organized. In this instance supply and demand affects the price paid for such labor. The demand for gold not only having enhanced its value,

but having prostrated business, throwing tens of thousands out of employment, the number seeking such employment makes an over-supply of such persons, and their salaries are reduced, so that store clerks who received twelve and fifteen dollars per week in 1873 now receive only five and seven dollars per week.

In fact the reduction of wages in this group of labor is carried to the point of paying only what is necessary for the person actually to subsist on, and in many instances it is carried beyond that. It is sometimes true that persons in this group are employed for about one-half what it should cost them to live, and they eke out an existence, or have a home where they do not pay board, but contribute what they get to the family expenses. It leaves little or nothing for clothes or medicine and makes their condition pitiable when no employment, or employment for a part of the time only, can be obtained. This fills the tenement houses and crowds such people toward cheaper and cheaper quarters.

The second group is: Organized labor.

Here too the supply is greater than the demand, except in some instances of skilled labor, when the demand is greater than the supply. Those coming generally under this head are organized and are men imbued with a principle. They have leaders and newspapers, labor organs. In this way they become united and disciplined. Each time they make a contest with contractors or employers, they either gain their point or inflict such an injury as to make them feared in the future. In this way they have prevented wages from declining as they would otherwise have done, but at a loss to themselves and the business interests of the country. Who has not seen such a contest in the

large cities? Who has not witnessed their discipline, their picket lines for blocks, and has not deplored the results? Several times in this city deaths on both sides, and always labor arraigned against labor—those wanting to work driven to it through necessity, and members of the union who did not want them to work.

This condition creates an army of idle laborers who drift into crime or become tramps. Organization sustains wages for those actually employed while engaged at work, but when you average the wages by including the unemployed, and include the expense and time lost, it does not do so. Make the calculation this way and you will find that the gold basis has measured itself in wages with mathematical accuracy.

This condition is not healthy, it is not good for the country, it breeds strife. It creates loss to industry and labor, it destroys manhood, it makes criminals. The cause for it should be removed. (Applause.)

The labor organizations will continue and have a right to continue as long as money is organized; as long as monopolies are organized. (Applause.) But we should have a civilization that would make it unnecessary for any organizations of that character to exist.

In Europe wages have been forced down to the legitimate level of the gold standard. The bayonet has been used to do it. Later it will do it here. The interest of the laboring man is on our side. We will hold his wages up without strikes or the expense of strikes.

As the gold of California and Australia raised his wages, so will the silver of our mountains as it pours into our metallic money stock as primary money raise his wages. There will be work for all,and the strife for labor will cease. Over-plenty, men will be brothers again.

We have seen how the farmer loses, also those who must sell what they produce to get pay for their labor. This has discouraged those vocations, and men and women have drifted to the cities. The cities have proportionately outgrown the country in population. With the unemployed, comes under-consumption. The trend of population should be to the country. To secure this, there must be an inducement; farming must be made profitable. You must advance prices so that the farmer can pay his taxes more easily, so he can sell his produce for more money. The rural population will thus increase. The farmer can live on what he raises. This makes him independent; an independent citizen is a good citizen, and is no man's slave. He is a patriot, and such men make a strong government. (Applause.)

Our national policy should cultivate the dignity of the country home. Prosperity and love of home among the producers of the soil build up individual and national character. This policy will draw away from the ranks of the wage-earners, give them happy homes, and leave the supply of wage-earners less than the demand. And this will raise the price of wage-earners' wages. The man who now has work or a situation, and selfishly reasons that he benefits himself by maintaining a dear dollar, is neither broad nor humane. He is assisting in wrecking his country, and it may be too late to remedy the error when he, too, is without employment. (Applause.) He should also think of opportunities for his children after he is gone.

Now are not we being deceived about wages being increased? I want to give you something to think about that may indicate that.

A few days ago there appeared in *The Chicago Tribune* an editorial in which appeared these words:

"The Pullman Palace Car Company is reported to have advanced the wages of the employés in its great shops near this city ten per cent. The increase affects about 4,000 men and was conceded by the company without demand by the toilers, or public announcement of the fact that it would be made."

On the same night the Associated Press sent a telegram from here which was published in the newspapers of the United States. I now read from the San Diego "*Daily Vidette*," where that telegram appeared:

"Chicago, July 7. The Pullman Palace Car Company has advanced the wages of employés at the Pullman shops ten per cent, the advance affecting about 4,000 people. No formal announcements have been made by the company of its action, as the advance has been gradually taking effect in various departments during the last two weeks."

Now what are the facts? In the same issue of *The Chicago Tribune* that published that editorial appeared a news article showing that in fact no advance in wages was made at Pullman, and that Mr. Pullman himself admitted that there was no advance made; that what they meant was that they had given the men that were at work about ten per cent more work to do. They had previously been working only half time. (Applause.)

DEBTS OF AMERICANS TO FOREIGNERS.

Mr. Horr: I have already called the attention of the country to the fact that the little boy "Coin" is absolutely without knowledge of mathematics or correct information concerning wealth, property or money. In his book the boy says, and Mr. Harvey in his debate repeats the assertion, that foreigners own real estate, personal property, bonds, stock and mortgages in the

United States to the amount of ten thousand million dollars.

I now state that there is no shadow of authority for such a statement, and when Mr. Harvey reads my statement as to the short-time debts he don't get out of his trouble, because the debts I referred to were those that accumulate every day, and every man who does an hour's work when the hour is completed has a credit for the amount of that work, and that work every week amounts to such a fabulous sum that you will be astounded when I come to that part of my talk.

MR. HARVEY: Do you say that I said that foreigners owned ten thousand million dollars' worth of property in this country?

MR. HORR: That is what you did say here.

MR. HARVEY: I don't know where I said it.

MR. HORR: You said that England owned five thousand million dollars, and the rest of Europe as much more.

MR. HARVEY: I did not say that. I said at least five thousand million dollars of debt are due in this country to people living in Europe.

MR. HORR: No, sir, you said five thousand million dollars in bonds to England alone, and here you give your table to show it in the second book, "Coin Up To Date."

MR. HARVEY: I am not discussing "Up To Date."

MR. HORR: Well, I am, I am discussing the table that you published to the world to prove that Coin's estimates are correct, and that table is here. You are trying to prove that the people of the United States on time debts owe $40,000,000,000. You claim it now, don't you?

MR. HARVEY: That we owe in all kinds of debts $40,000,000,000. Yes, that is correct. But not to Europe.

Mr. Horr: I did not say so. As I remember, he said to Great Britain five thousand million and the rest of Europe about the same. He is right as to the fact that the rest of Europe is about the same as Great Britain. But now, then, I want to get at this statement of his if I can.

Mr. Harvey, when asked by my friend Robinson yesterday, could not tell when or where or how one dollar of the vast sum of money required to purchase all this marvelous amount of bonds and mortgages, real estate, etc., came to this country. Dr. Robinson did not ask him whether we did not owe Europe that amount; Dr. Robinson wanted him to tell when the money was sent here—and I will add now—how they sent it. How did it get here? I know he won't answer that, because the exports and imports of all kinds of property and of gold are a matter of record, and if he has studied the problem carefully he will find that there is no proof of any such sum ever coming from Europe to this country. We do not owe Europe any such amount, and it is a simple attempt of his to overstate so as to make us a great calamity nation.

By his refusal to answer that question he acknowledges that he has no knowledge of any large foreign investments here in this country.

The boy was led to make this overestimate by his eagerness to prove all our people paupers and debtors, and he got that same trouble honestly, for his father here claims the same thing, you know. Like all Mr. Harvey's works, he overdoes the business. Let us see now how he does it. In the Appendix to "Coin's Financial School" is given what is called "A partial exhibit of the private and public debt of the United States at the present time." On page 29 Mr. Harvey

repeats the figures of his earlier volume, and adds others, and makes an exhibit of public and private debt of $40,000,000,000, and I begin by calling attention to the few figures which correspond with the authorities.

The first two statements in your table, Mr. Harvey, the national and other public indebtedness, are correct. I have not verified the statement as to railroads and railroad bonds. I will assume them also to be correct. The other statements, eleven in number, are all of them incorrect. In his later book he gives the private mortgage debt of the United States in 1890 under three heads at $8,500,000,000. Extra Census Bulletin No. 7, issued before the first edition of "Coin's Financial School," gives the exact figures of such debts and gives the amount at $6,619,000,000. Here is a discrepancy between the official figures and the figures of this inspired boy of $2,000,000,000—a mere trifle—probably Harvey will call it trifling even to refer to it.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr, will you hand me the Census Bulletin you refer to?

MR. HORR: I will bring it to you. I haven't got it here. I intended to bring it. You have one, you had one the other day here.

MR. HARVEY: If you have compared my figures with the proper official report from Washington you know they are right.

MR. HORR: I have compared them with the Official Bulletin, and I know they are wrong. It is published in the book, the whole thing. The mistake he makes in that item is equal to all the property of every kind and description in the State of Iowa.

After his mortgage figures "Coin" gives what purports to be a statement on the authority of the United States Statistical Abstract of the loans of national, saving and

state banks, and loan and trust companies. His figures agree with none that I can find in any volume of the abstract. They are larger than those that the authorities stated in 1890 and 1894. But the difference between Mr. Coin's figures and those found in the official document is small, and I drop that part of it.

WAGES IN THE UNITED STATES TO-DAY.

MR. HARVEY: I was speaking of how false reports had been sent over the United States in regard to the increase in wages. We find that it has been done here in Chicago, as I have stated. No report, I am informed, has been sent out by the Press Association from this city to correct that statement that the Pullman Palace Car Company had increased wages ten per cent.

Where that cruel serfdom exists as a blot upon civilization, to which the attention of the world has recently been called, and the man who did it is now heralded to the world as a philanthropist, as a man who voluntarily increased the wages of his men, it was but fair that it should be contradicted, and I give it as strong publicity here as I can. (Applause.) May we not infer from that which we know that many of these other telegrams that we read in the newspapers about the increase in wages amount to about the same thing?

We know that strikes are now prevalent in many parts of the country. I have here, with which I will not now prolong this debate, some fifteen or twenty news items in papers within the last twenty days, of strikes. We can reasonably infer that those are true, but we have nothing authentic upon which to base a statement that wages have been increased lately.

I have in my hand a letter from Thomas I. Kidd, the general secretary of the Machine Wood Workers' International Union. In this letter Mr. Kidd says:

"In Omaha, Nebraska, wages paid carpenters fifteen years ago was $2.75 per day. Now the average is less than $2 per day. In Chicago, wood workers used to receive as high as $3 to $3.50 per day, the average probably being about $2.75, while to-day the average is less than $1.75, with quite a number of competent mechanics working for $7.50 and $9 per week. In Marshfield, Wis., according to reports which I have from our local union at that point, quite a number of wood-workers receive only 50 cents per day, and it is impossible that wages could have been less than that prior to the demonetization of silver. Oshkosh, Wis., reports the average wage for wood-workers at $1 per day. Old members of our Unions in that city tell me that fifteen years ago the wage was about $2.50 average. In Sheboygan, Wis., a number of the men who struck recently for higher wages were receiving only 60 and 70 cents per day and even less.

"The wages of workers in the Cigar Makers' International Union have increased steadily since they acquired the power that it has so wisely and judiciously wielded during the past twelve or fourteen years."

Mr. Kidd encloses in that letter a copy of their newspaper organ, and from that I read you this:

"The garment maker who used to receive $2.50 for making an overcoat is now paid 75 and 80 cents for the same piece of work. Plush cloaks that used to pay the workmen $3.50 for the making now pay only 85 cents. If clothes and food embraced all the necessities of the laboring people, the dollar would unquestionably be of greater value to them than ever."

Now, Mr. Horr, I call your special attention to this:

"—But they do not, and what the laborer may save by cheaper clothes and food is more than offset by increased rent alone. Then, again, the American mechanic is a greater consumer than he was thirty years ago. Articles that were luxuries then are almost indispensable to his health and comfort now, so that when all things are considered the relative value of the dollar is no greater now than it was in 1865."

I pass the letter to Mr. Horr.

The difference between the actual and the theoretical time and earnings of workmen is shown in the Sixth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor (1890). A group of 67 establishments engaged in the pig-iron industry reported that for a period covering one year the actual average daily earnings of their employés were \$1.62, working a total number of 24,685 days, averaging 178 days, earning a total amount of \$40,029 and averaging \$288 per man. If the workmen in these establishments had had continuous work the Commissioner of Labor estimates that but 70.33 employés would have been necessary, and the consequent average earnings of each employé for the period would have been \$569. But as a fact they only received \$288. This is the difference between actual and theoretical reasoning.

One trouble that all labor will now recognize in the United States is that on account of the depressed condition of affairs laborers are not working full time. The unions have succeeded in holding up the price per diem, but the men are not working more, say, than one-half the time, which is making that much less in dollars that they are receiving.

Mr. Horr and I have discussed tenancy in this country, and we have discussed the condition of laborers. I could best refer this question to the farmers and the laborers themselves as those best able to decide between Mr. Horr and myself as to which is right.

But I want to make this proposition to Mr. Horr as to tenancy; that if the committee that arranged this debate will arrange another debate with some gentleman who will be acceptable to take the other side I will debate this proposition:

"Resolved, That twenty million acres of land in the

United States to-day is owned by English lords and titled nobility, and that the English land tenancy has to that extent been already introduced into this country."

And I will take the affirmative of that proposition. Right now I will dispose of it by pointing you to this fact: That in the state of Illinois there is a county by the name of Logan, that has a county seat by the name of Lincoln, and that you can drive for miles through that county on your way to that county seat, and have on both sides of you Lord Scully's possessions with the Irish thatched cottages over the land. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: I desire to say in reply to that last challenge of his that I am not worried about that question. I have traveled extensively, very extensively through thirty-one states of this Union, and I never yet saw a single farm nor had my attention called to one that was owned by people living outside of the United States. There are some, but they are few.

Now Mr. Harvey is at the same old game again. He has found *The Chicago Tribune* making an incorrect statement about the Pullman laborers, and, full of glee, and of his affection for that paper—of course that has its influence—he points out their mistake, and then asks in his peculiar way, "Are we to infer that this is a fair sample of all the rest of the newspapers in the United States? Is it true that all the other statements we hear about wages being advanced are, like this, untrue?" What do you think about it, Brother Harvey? I will let you answer me now.

Mr. Harvey: Go on, Mr. Horr.

Mr. Horr: Why, he seems to be worried for fear wages have gone up. I am rejoiced at it. I have been in ever so many towns where the advance has taken

place. I have been in more than a dozen factories within the last four months where the boys are getting better pay. You can tell such a factory, by the peculiar expression of their faces; they are happier. They even smile, though they know it will make Harvey feel bad.

Why, I am glad that the American people are able to pay a little more for work than they have been paying. It rejoices me, every instance that I read about, and I now and then believe an instance of that kind when a reputable paper states it. I suppose there is now and then a newspaper man that can tell the truth—I know Harvey thinks it is doubtful. (Laughter.) I don't wonder he is in doubt about it, but myself being a newspaper man, I know there is one, anyhow, that can tell the truth. (Laughter and applause.)

DEBTS TO FOREIGNERS.

Now proceeding with the debt business. You made a large error in your statement as to the loans of the banks, an error of about one thousand millions difference from the official statement of these very debts—a small matter, you know—that is, when he is proving something against his own country he talks of thousands of millions of dollars as glibly as an ordinary person talks of nickels. (Applause.) It is owing to that immense financial breadth of his. (Laughter.) You cannot account for it in any other way.

Now that represents the loans of savings banks secured by mortgages—listen—and which were previously included in the exhibit of private mortgage debts. You understand, he has first given the indebtedness of the mortgages, then he has added to the amount the indebtedness to the savings banks, which includes a large

part of these very mortgage debts, so he adds them up twice and that swells the number. Why didn't you add them in again? You could have gotten as much again that way. (Laughter.)

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr, this is a serious matter. Will you produce that table of yours, and let me compare it with my table? This is no funny business.

MR. HORR: This is no funny business. I have something that will worry you worse than this. I have the books here.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr, will you produce the table here?

MR. HORR. It is not a table, it is a statement of amounts.

MR. HARVEY: Will you give me the official document?

MR. HORR: If you will look it up and see if I am wrong, I will own it. (Laughter.) I know I am not.

Then in "Up To Date" is a small item of eight thousand million dollars, which "Coin" says, without a shadow of authority, should be added to these debts as a guess, to those already referred to, on account of the increase between 1890 and 1894; he says "estimated." Estimated by whom? Why, guessed at by a man who is at work trying to make it as bad as he can. He could just as well have said sixteen thousand million as eight. It would be just about as true, because the public debts as a whole, according to the authorities, have been decreasing since 1890. The loans of banks and trust companies have also decreased, as shown by the report of the United States Comptroller of the Currency. All investigations made by the authorities in the several states since 1890 go to show that the relative burden of debt is decreasing, with a slight increase of the total for the growing states and for the nation.

The total increase of all debts from 1880 to 1890 was about three thousand million; from 1890 to date it cannot exceed one thousand million. So he has an error there of just about seven thousand million—a slight thing for Harvey, but that amount would break me. (Laughter.)

Now, after these errors, "Coin" proceeds to make others. He gives statements of various debts as follow (from "Coin's Financial School Up to Date," page 129):

U. S. Census 1890, national debt................	$ 891,960,104
State and municipal debt (U. S. Census, 1890).	1,135,210,442
Railway bonds on 171,866 miles railway, 1892 (Poor's Manual '93)....	5,463,611,204
The average farm and home debt shown by tabulation of partial returns from counties distributed throughout the Union, is $1,288 for farm and $924 for homes. If this average holds good for the United States, there is an existing debt in force, on the farms and homes of the United States occupied by owner (R. B. Porter, Supt. 11th Census, in *North American Review*, volume 153, page 618) of.........	2,500,000,000
Mortgaged indebtedness of business realty, street railways, manufactories and business enterprises (estimated from partial reports of 11th census)..................................	5,000,000,000
Loans from 3,773 national banks (Statistical Abstracts of the United States)..............	2,153,769,806
Loans from 5,579 state, savings, stock and private banks and trust companies (Statistical Abstracts of the United States).........	2,201,764,292
These are figures on which something definite has been obtained, also the ratio of increase from 1880 to 1890, which was from $6,750,000,000 in 1880 to $19,000,000,000 in 1890. By computing the same ratio of increase we should now add..	8,000,000,000
Mortgage debts on homes not occupied by owner (estimated)............................	1,000,000,000
Overdue accounts due merchants, wholesale and retail, drawing from 6 to 10 per cent interest (estimated)........................	5,000,000,000
Debts due pawnbrokers drawing from 60 to 120 per cent per annum or 5 to 10 per cent a month (estimated).........................	1,000,000,000

Private debts due from individuals to individuals and of which there is no public record or other data for census officers to obtain information (estimated)	1,000,000,000
Maritime debts (estimated)	1,000,000,000
Overdrafts, judgments, taxes, miscellaneous items of indebtedness not covered in any of the foregoing (estimated)	4,000,000,000
Total	$40,346,315,848

This makes a total of $12,000,000,000 under these five items.

Now I shall examine in my next talk his item on maritime property, $1,000,000,000, and I don't say that Harvey will own up—I don't say that he will leave the room in a sort of disgust with himself—no—I don't expect he will, but I will agree to show this audience how ridiculous his statement is, and those books I have right here.

Mr. Harvey: If Mr. Horr will begin his talk on the debt proposition by explaining away his own proposition made the other day, it will be more satisfactory, I think, in this debate. He said that long-time debts were only a very small part of all our debts. I have shown him that these long-time debts were $19,000,000,000, and that if that is only a small part I have asked him to make up the balance of the forty million for me.

Mr. Horr: Now, Brother Harvey, you have interrupted me several times—the list that you give here does not include a dollar of those short-time debts that I referred to. You give the debts, not of people who owe for labor every week at all, that is not in your list. I am talking about the list you made out. Now stick to that if you can. (Laughter.)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr seems to think there are debts that are not in that list (laughter); if it is

any satisfaction to him, he can add the debts he speaks of to my list. (Laughter and continued applause.) No one who will seriously study this question of debts will arrive at any other conclusion than I have.

Before this debate closes—for, as I said before, I shall give my entire time Monday to the independent action of the United States—I desire to answer in this debate a proposition that is being industriously circulated all over the United States, I want to get an answer to it in this debate that will be sufficient, the answer that ought to be made to it.

The proposition I refer to is made by the gold-standard men that all of our efforts for the restoration of silver are for the interests of silver-bullion owners. They have thus been impressing the people with this idea, that it is one selfish interest in this country contending against another selfish interest, so that many of you have been indifferent while thinking that. It is not true. In our struggle to restore a sufficient volume of primary money in this country we have turned our attention to silver to right the wrong that was committed, and to restore to the people that which was the people's money, irrespective of who owned that property. We do not object to gold because the gold miners produce it, and the arguments that the gentleman makes about silver producers could be made with the same force about the gold producers. But I want to make another answer to it. I want to say to you that the silver producers have not assisted in running this campaign. (Applause.) If they were assisting any one, it is reasonable to suppose that they had assisted me. I began my work in May, 1893, by publishing a weekly paper, and commenced bringing out books in December, 1893. I became chairman of the bimetallic executive commit-

tee of this state in the summer of 1893. My committee appealed personally and by letter to about all the silver-mine owners in the west for donations to assist us. We did not receive a cent. At one time I sent out forty-four letters to selected names of as many prominent silver-mine owners who were supposed to be wealthy—such men as Moffit and Shear of Colorado and Clark of Montana—and did not receive a cent from them, not even enough to pay the postage used on the letters; not even the courtesy of a reply, except from one.

At the time I brought out "Coin's Financial School" I was in debt and had no money left. I had spent all of my money and $2,800 borrowed from a banker in Utah on a mortgage on improved property, which he afterward foreclosed when I was in my greatest trouble. I owned valuable unimproved property in the silver states that was unincumbered. I wrote numerous letters to prominent mine owners, stating my situation, and asked for a mortgage loan. I failed in each instance. In August, 1894, seeing that I could go no further without money, I went personally to Denver and saw most of the silver-bullion owners of Denver, and offered unincumbered property at Pueblo, Colorado, that cost me $37,500, on which I had bankers' certificates showing a cash valuation of $20,000. They all refused to loan me any money. I was told that I could not borrow on the property because it was unimproved and had no rental value. I found that the bullion owners who had money were bankers, the others were all hard pressed for money. I appealed to these bankers, among them the president of the Globe Smelting Company, to waive the fact that my property was not improved, and to loan me money on it. He refused. I then asked him to go with me and talk with others

who had money, and they together to make up a loan. This he declined to do also. I then tried to sell my property, and found there was no market and that I could not get an offer. I then returned to Chicago without a cent. I was in debt $1,300 and had no money. On the day I returned, my only clerk absconded with what little money had come into the office in my absence. On my desk I found a letter from my wife, who was in Ohio with our children, asking for money to come home. I had no money to send her. I did not have money enough that night to buy my supper.

At this moment Judge Miller (applause), who is now presiding as one of the judges in this debate, came into my office. I told him of my trip to Denver and the result, and that I was going to close my office. He abruptly, as it seemed to me at the time, got up and left the room. About two hours later he returned and said that he had been home; that he and his wife had talked the matter over; that they had some money, and wanted to know how much I thought would pull me through. I told him I thought two thousand dollars would. With it I could pay my debts, and the balance would hold out till I got "Coin's Financial School" before the people. He loaned me the two thousand dollars. (Applause.) I since have returned it to him. Judge Miller has no interest in silver mines, and he saved my office when the silver-mine owners refused assistance. (Applause.)

From the time I began to the present moment I have never received a cent from the silver states or from any one else, except in the regular sales of my literature, and $500 given me by a gentleman* living in Philadelphia, and $10 that came to me in an anonymous letter.

What the people do not understand is this: The silver-mine owners who have money are all money-lenders,

*W. J. Cheney, 220 South 4th Street, Philadelphia.

and they have that country covered with mortgages.

All the other mine owners are poor. They are in debt. They would give if they had it.

The recent Salt Lake City convention, that was supposed to have raised $500,000, appears to have raised nothing. I was told by the men engaged in calling it that it was for the purpose of purchasing "Coin's Financial Schools." I have not seen a cent from it. Not a book has been purchased with money raised there to my knowledge. I am informed that it was a failure.

I had a letter from there in the last few days stating that it had proved an entire failure; that the men who called it and met together were men who would have given money if they had it. They thought if they appointed committees and went among the bankers and those who had money they would get it, but that they had been disappointed.

I now want to say this to the people of the United States. This cause does not need money. There is something worth more than money, and that is manhood. (Applause.) A volunteer soldier will whip three hired soldiers. (Applause.) And so it is in this cause, where we struggle to promote humanity and just government. One patriot rising up as a power in his community, is worth three hired men. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: I have been very much touched (laughter) by the sympathetic story of my friend. I always feel sad when any one is in grief, and I rejoice at the kind treatment he received from our good friend, the chairman of this debate. I would have expected as much from that gray-headed countenance as it sits before me. That he did not do any good for his country, has nothing to do with his generosity. That the saving of Harvey's "Financial School" was a blessing to the

world is a question that I have some doubts about. (Laughter.) And my doubts are very serious because he bases his assertions, in order to make the conditions of the people of my country out worse than they are, upon misrepresentations for the purpose of bolstering up a false theory. All his great statements are guesses except the few first ones.

DEBT FIGURES ANALYZED.

As an illustration now I take the maritime debts which he states at one thousand million dollars. He seems to have one thousand million on the brain, and he never gets below it. Now the total tonnage, Brother Harvey, of the United States in 1894, according to the Statistical Abstract, page 420—and I now hand the book to Mr. Harvey (laughter)—was 4,684,029 tons. This includes both steam and sailing vessels. The census gives an average valuation of the tonnage at $52 a ton. This would make a total valuation for all the vessels in 1894 of only $243,000,000. This inspired boy guesses that the debts against this property are four times more than the property itself is worth. Now no sane man would loan on such risky property over fifty per cent of its value, hence the maritime debt could not have exceeded one-eighth of what your "Coin" guessed it at, and the bulk of that debt appears in the loans of banks. If "Coin" made the same mistake, as he probably did, in the other items of these debts that he guessed at, he has stated them at least eight times their amount. The error in that case after the first five items of "Coin's" exhibit of debts would be eleven thousand five hundred million. This added to those already pointed out makes him make a mistake of about twenty-two thousand million dollars in his estimate. Now if we get it right, nineteen thousand million is a good

deal of money to owe, but why undertake to more than double the debts of the people of this country?

Ah! but wait. He doesn't take into account the doubling of debts that under his system would be constantly going on in his computation. Let me show you what occurs in every-day life, Mr. Harvey. A man buys a farm, he pays for it or is to pay for it $20,000—it is a large farm. He pays $10,000, he gives a mortgage of $10,000 more. The seller has no farm. He seeks another farm, and finds one that he likes better than the one he sold. He says to the owner, "What will you take for your farm?" "$20,000." "Well, I will take it if you will take half cash and a mortgage, a good one, that I have got, of $10,000." "Well," he says, "I will sell you the farm for $20,000, but I don't know anything about your other farm, I am not familiar with that security. I will take a mortgage back on my own farm that I know all about, and you can keep your mortgage and collect that to pay me with." "Well," he says, "I know my farm I sold first is all right, I can get my money out of that, I will do it." Thus $10,000 more debt is created.

They repeat that from one part of the country to the other, each time making a new mortgage, but simply for the first debt owed by the first man. And in the reports that you quote from, you would have the debts quoted at one hundred thousand, but the payment in the first transaction would pay every one of the others. Consequently "Coin's" statement of the indebtedness does not represent the real indebtedness of the country at all. It has been doubled ten times—ah, more than that. The man who first gave the $10,000 perhaps had a bond, a city bond of $10,000, he thinks he would like to keep that, so he gives a mortgage on his farm and keeps the bond. He can turn it any minute for the

money. He didn't really owe the mortgage because he had the wherewithal right there to pay it. And you duplicate in that way the debts of the country over and over again. And that creeps into every one of your little boy's computations. Why, the young rascal, he didn't know anything about mathematics, don't you see? (Laughter and applause.) He did not know anything about the business of the world. He started out to teach the A B C of finance, and he did not know his letters himself. You see the difficulty.

Now I wish to say to the people here before I sit down, as this is my last talk to-day, the creditors of the country in numbers are always enormously greater than the debtors. You must strike a balance before you call a man a debtor, and see whether he owes more than he has got owing to him. The reason I state that the number of creditors is so large is that I have learned from a careful study of statistics that the people of this country have $200,000,000 due them every week for labor. That amount has to be paid, the bulk of it, at the end of the week; but during the week they are all creditors. You take every vocation in life, and the men who are creditors, properly speaking, are the great mass of the people, and the money that has been loaned years ago and is now out in the form of bonds is usually owed by rich corporations, large moneyed men, and is owed to the common people of every country that is civilized.

MR. HARVEY: All that it is necessary to reply to in what Mr. Horr has just said is this: That in computing the number of creditors and debtors in this country relatively, he has no right to count the wage-workers of this country as creditors, because a week's wages happens to be due them at the time he counts them.

(Applause.) That a man who has ten or fifteen dollars due him, who at the same time owes for grocery bills or other debts a larger sum than that ten or fifteen dollars, it is miserably ridiculous to have him counted in the creditor class. (Applause.) You cannot, Mr. Horr, in defending the creditors of old England and New England, get any sympathy or assistance from allies that you are not entitled to, from men whom you seek to make your allies, by a pretense that is base and false.

Debts in this country have accumulated until men are now mortgaging property that they never thought of mortgaging before. When I say pawnbrokers I also have reference to the chattel-mortgage fiend, so called, who loans at from two to five per cent per month. Warehouses are now being constructed to store furniture—furniture that the owners ought to be sleeping on. I will drop this subject because the least intimation makes the people know what I mean, by saying that I hold in my hand a book that gives the chattel-mortgages in the State of Nebraska. Under a law there the owners of chattel mortgages were required to record them or they could not collect their money. And this book that I hold in my hand and pass over to Mr. Horr shows that there is a per capita indebtedness in the state of Nebraska on chattel mortgages alone of $19 per capita, and that does not include the actual "three-ball" pawn-shops, and I had a right when I said that the pawnbrokers of the United States had the people in debt to them $1,000,000,000—I had a right to say it, and it was true, as every other item in that list is true, which I have not now the time to answer without exhausting the words of this debate.

I want to say this: Since this debate began I have followed its logical arrangement. Much more might

have been said upon our side of this debate if it had not been diverted at almost every step after we had passed through the first chapter, ending with the crime of 1873. We stayed together as far as that. Since then Mr. Horr has diverted this argument, and had he not done so it probably might have been more educational. This debate is now coming to a close, except Monday, when we treat on Independent Action of the United States, and as I wish nothing Monday to interfere with what I shall say on that subject, I now desire to refer to an unpleasant matter.

Since Mr. Horr came to Chicago, in newspaper interviews and in words used in this debate, he has alluded to me in very uncomplimentary language, and to my manuscript, to my manner and method of presenting great truths to you. I am going to answer Mr. Horr, and, Mr. Horr, my answer is this: That I regard this debate as a great question involving the interests of the American people. My further answer is this: it concerns you. You are a man of vast experience. You are, of all the public orators and debaters, the foremost in America. You, as the financial writer of *The New York Tribune*, are the best-posted man in the United States upon the gold-standard side of this question. You were selected by the committee of bankers of this city for the reason that you are the ablest man in America to present it on their side. If there has been any weakness in your argument it has not been on your account, it has been on account of your cause. (Continued applause.)

A SOUVENIR OF THE DEBATE.

I have no word of reproach to pass back to you, I have only words of kindness to give you. And, in addition to that, I am going to do something that will cause

you to remember this debate. I am going to give to you a souvenir by which you may remember it. On the first day of this debate, when it was a question of supremacy between my cause and your cause, when it was a question of what was the monetary unit of measure in our coinage system fixed by our forefathers, I introduced many witnesses, among them Jefferson, the committee that was appointed to fix a monetary unit, the Board of Treasury, Secretary Gallatin of the Treasury, Chief-Justice Chase, and others. But they are all now dead. I introduced one living witness, it was the dollar itself of 1799, with the word "unit" upon it. I am now going to give this coin to Mr. Horr. (Applause.) Take it, Mr. Horr. Washington may have carried it in his pocket; Jefferson may at one time have had it in his possession; it may have paid for the paper on which the declaration of war was written in 1812 against Great Britain. It may have been fondled by Jackson when writing his message to Congress against the national bank. (Applause.) It is a fit souvenir for any American proud of his country and of its institutions to carry in his pocket all the days of his life. (Passing dollar to Mr. Horr.) (Applause, shouts, cries of "Hurrah!" and continued applause.)

Mr. Horr: This little episode, according to all the rules of parliamentary debate and of social courtesy, requires a fitting reply of thanks to my friend for this very kind action. I must say, however, that I do not deserve one half the eulogy he gives me. I came to this city myself expecting to discuss this question in a scientific and in what I call a straightforward way. I am not the most eloquent defender of the gold-standard in the United States. I am perhaps an experienced public debater, that is, have met many of the leading

men of the United States who differ with me on other great questions. I came here expecting that the debate would be carried on courteously, quietly, and that I was to receive the treatment due to me as a gentleman. I have never yet complained of Mr. Harvey of one iota of discourtesy, or of anything of the kind. I don't hold him responsible for the treatment I received through the first four days of this debate. I will leave it to him whether I wasn't compelled in self-defense to assert myself in order to stop the interruptions with which his sympathizers attempted to drive me out of this debate. And if I am guilty of any discourtesy, it isn't to you, Brother Harvey, nor could you control the men who forced me to say what I said. I was forced to say things that I never before in my life said to a public audience, but I had to do it in self-defense. Now as the debate closes, I desire to say to you that I shall keep this dollar, and put it to a good use. I intend to have a hole bored through it, and then I will hang it around the neck of my little grandchild, born just as we commenced this discussion. (Applause.) It does me good, Brother Harvey, to learn that the people of the United States still (in spite of the gold standard) marry and are given in marriage, and that children are still born to them in spite of the silver dollar. (Laughter and applause.) I desire to say now in all kindness, I am a friend of the American people. All this talk of Mr. Harvey about my representing the gold-bugs and all that is simply bosh. I represent myself, and never during my entire connection with the paper on which I now work did any owner or manager of that paper ever attempt to dictate one word to me as to what I should write on any question except that I should state my honest convictions. (Applause.) Patriotism isn't

all wrapped up in your side of this cause. There are a good many people just as honest as you or me who believe that it would lead to ruin to adopt Mr. Harvey's theories and place this nation on a silver standard, and they stand appalled before the attempt. Now next Monday I shall show you what I think will result from doing that. I shall not do it harshly. I do sometimes speak pointedly, I expect—I am an intense man, I feel a thing when I do feel it, I am good for nothing except when I am talking what I honestly believe. You think that you could bless the people of this country. I think that your policy will bring such disaster to this nation as no people on the face of the earth ever before suffered. Now if I believe it shall I hold my peace? No. If the people of this nation adopt the policy which he advocates they will do it in spite of my protest. If you can succeed in convincing them, go ahead. I will do what I can to check you in your work. (Applause.)

Mr. Harvey: If the judges please: In bringing this debate to-day to a close as I did, and presenting Mr. Horr with what our interpretation of an honest dollar is, to take back home with him, I did not mean to prolong this debate, but Mr. Horr has said something that ought not to go on this record without an explanation. He has said words which would indicate that this audience of gentlemen have treated him rudely. Now I don't want to disagree with Mr. Horr, and I do not want to say enough in what I am saying now to raise any contention here, but I want to say this, that these gentlemen who have been here present during this debate have been invited by the committee in charge, and they are all gentlemen, and the day that Mr. Horr refers to was the day that we were discussing the Act of 1873. Now we all know that when you come to a dis-

cussion of that act, how it was passed, it is the most excitable subject in this whole controversy. Our men are earnest, zealous, life is real with them, and they are simply earnest men, and it was the applause that caused a seeming interruption of the debate. On the other hand, Mr. Horr is a man whom it is difficult to listen to without enjoying what he says. He gives a turn to points in the debate which causes people to laugh at times; and it was more—I submit to the judges—it was more a matter of the audience enjoying or applauding both of the speakers that caused what Mr. Horr has placed a wrong construction upon. I don't think any one in this audience has acted ungentlemanly, he has simply shown the fervor of his emotions.

JUDGE MILLER: I wish to say a word. When this debate commenced the first day there was a good deal of applause on either side, and it seemed to me that this applause would interrupt or weaken the very object of this debate, it might have that effect. And I therefore endeavored to suppress it as well as I could, but upon reflection I observed that the speakers themselves were not injured by it. It seemed to me that it met their approval, and in reflecting I thought that perhaps these speeches—able as they have been, all of them—in going before the people, if they were punctured by applause here and there showing that the audience appreciated the points that were made, it might have a good effect. I therefore desisted from any further attempt to suppress applause. On Saturday of last week I noticed when Mr. Horr was upon his feet answering questions some persons in the audience applauded a question while he was holding it in his hand. I immediately suggested that that thing be stopped; that the audience should show themselves in sympathy with the speaker

on either side while he was upon the floor, so as to encourage him, not discourage him. That applause was not proper, under those circumstances. But I have no idea that the gentlemen who indulged in it intended any insult to Mr. Horr, and I do not think it is just to have the impression go abroad in this city or elsewhere that there is any person in this audience that has knowingly or intentionally treated Mr. Horr with the slightest discourtesy. (Applause.) I certainly think, that, high as his position was before he came here, it will be still higher when he leaves Chicago. (Applause.) We all of us esteem him very highly, and there is not a gentleman in this room that has intentionally offered him any insult or discourtesy whatever. (Applause.)

This ended the debate for the day, and questions were received from the audience as follow:

MR. HARVEY: Question from William McKee, Chicago: "If Congress should pass a law ordering the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, if I owed you a thousand dollars, and I should go to you with a thousand dollars of gold in my right hand and a thousand dollars of silver in my left hand, and wanted to pay you, which would you accept?"

On the conditions named by the question, that the mints of the United States were open to the free coinage of silver with gold at the ratio of 16 to 1, both moneys were full legal tender, no discrimination made in favor of either as against the other, it would make no difference which I accepted, to me, or any one else. The silver would be worth as much as the gold. If you received the silver you could take it and with it buy the same quantity of gold. (Applause). The question will be more fully answered Monday.

MR. HORR: Question from Robert Schilling, of Mil-

waukee, Wis.: "How do you determine the market value of gold? in what definite measure?"

It is determined by comparing it with all the other products of the world, and its value depends upon the supply and demand for the article itself.

MR. HARVEY: Question from H. L. Bliss, of Chicago: "The export price of wheat given in 'Coin' and in the Statistical Abstract which you claim to quote is as follows:

Coin.		Abstract.	
1891	.85	1891	$ .93
1892	.80	1892	1.03
1893	.63	1893	.80

In 1873 wheat was $1.31 currency, equal to $1.16 gold. 'Coin's' figures are $1.25 gold. Please reconcile."

In making that table of wheat and cotton and silver prices that Mr. Bliss refers to I used the Statistical Abstract for all the years down to and including 1890, and made the calculation back of 1879 for the premium that was on gold and deducted that from the price and made the price of 1873 $1.25; and Mr. Bliss, by using some other calculation, makes it $1.16. I was probably right. The Statistical Abstract was all right down to 1891. Now beginning with 1891 the Statistical Abstract prices did not agree with other prices that were then current and before me. I want to say right here that statistics are now being made at Washington to entrench the money power. In 1891, '92, and '93, your own knowledge of the price of wheat being so recent will confirm the figures in "Coin's Financial School." Now in addition to that I make a part of this answer a table on prices of wheat made from different reports, showing the difference in different price tables during those and other years. [See pages 428–429.]

Mr. Horr: Question from G. L. McKean: "Tuesday you said, 'The price of articles is affected by the entire circulating medium of the country;' if so, does not the large issue of currency by national banks since last March help to account for the rise in prices since that time, and likewise the keeping of gold in this country through the government's employment of gold brokers?"

I don't know just exactly what he means by the last clause. I want to understand it.

Mr. McKean: I refer you to the files of *The New York Tribune* in regard to the transaction of the Rothschilds' syndicate with the United States Treasury.

Mr. Horr: I don't now get any light. I said that the price of articles is affected by the entire circulating medium of the country, everything used in the payment for goods as well as final redemption money. Now he wants to know, if that is so, does not the large issue of currency by national banks since last March help to account for the rise in prices since that time? I should think probably it would have some effect. I would have to find out how much there is compared with the entire business done, and after I had done that I couldn't tell anything very definite about it. It is one of those things you can talk about, but you don't know anything about it after you get through. There is no way to figure, you can't get at anything that is mathematical. But the gold business—I don't know what he means by it.

Mr. McKean: What do you mean, Mr. Horr? Do you mean you don't know anything about the transaction, the employment of gold brokers, or you don't understand the question?

Mr. Horr: I don't understand what you are driving at.

TABLE OF STATISTICS

On the prices of Wheat per bushel for a number of years, compiled from various authorities, showing how statistics vary.

Year.	Fiscal Year ending June 30. Export Price of Wheat. U. S. Statistical Abstract 1889 and 1894. *a*	Calendar Year. Average Price of Wheat for the U. S. Statistical Abstract of 1886 and 1894. *b*	Calendar Year. Price of Northern Wheat. H. C. Burchard, Director of U. S. Mint. N. Y. Market in Currency. *c*	The same in Gold.	Calendar Year. Price of Western Wheat. H. C. Burchard, Director U. S. Mint. N. Y. Market in Currency. *c*	The same in Gold.	The Journal of Political Economy, Dec. 1892. T. B. Veblen, University of Chicago. No. 2 Spring Wheat, Gold Price, Chicago. *d*	Same authority. British Wheat Gazette Average. In Great Britain. Gold. *e*	Same authority. American No. 2 Red Winter Wheat in Mark Lane, London. Gold. *f*	Chicago Board of Trade Statistics. Home Grown Wheat in England. Gold. *g*	Same authority. Chicago Highest and lowest price No. 2 Spring Wheat. *h*
1859	$ .950	$	$1.435	$.....	$.....	$.....	$.....	$.....	$.....	$.....	$ .50 to $1.15
1860	.981	....	1.495	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.66 " 1.13
1861	1.226	....	1.425	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.55 " 1.25
1862	1.144	.937	1.390	1.297	.....	.....	.677	1.583	.....	.....	.65 " .92
1863	1.293	1.140	1.640	1.129	.....	.....	.683	1.279	.....	1.34½	.88 " 1.12
1864	1.327	1.831	1.942	.955	2.000	.984	.741	1.148	.....	1.20½	1.07 " 2.26
1865	1.952	1.463	2.160	1.373	1.969	1.252	.706	1.195	.....	1.25½	.85 " 1.55
1866	1.406	2.195	2.945	2.090	2.366	1.679	.935	1.426	.....	1.49¾	.70 " 2.03
1867	1.272	1.985	2.844	2.059	2.248	1.627	1.432	1.840	.....	1.93½	1.55 " 2.85
1868	1.897	1.424	2.541	1.819	2.145	1.534	1.229	1.821	.....	1.91½	1.04 " 2.20
1869	1.388	.941	1.651	1.241	1.441	1.083	.8408	1.376	.....	1.44¾	.76 " 2.47
1870	1.29	1.042	1.373	1.194	1.132	.984	.8379	1.338	.....	1.40½	.73 " 1.31
1871	1.32	1.258	1.581	1.414	1.522	1.362	1.082	1.619	1.626	1.70	.99 " 1.32
1872	1.47	1.240	1.780	1.584	1.680	1.495	1.115	1.629	1.713	1.71	1.01 " 1.61
1873	1.31	1.150	1.787	1.570	1.673	1.470	1.029	1.676	1.829	1.76	.89 " 1.46
1874	1.43	.941	1.517	1.363	1.443	1.297	.976	1.590	1.655	1.67	.81 " 1.28
1875	1.12	1.000	1.403	1.220	1.239	1.077	.889	1.290	1.393	1.35½	.83 " 1.30
1876	1.24	1.031	1.320	1.185	1.181	1.060	.926	1.319	1.393	1.38½	.83 " 1.26
1877	1.17	1.082	1.685	1.607	1.504	1.434	1.215	1.591	1.597	1.60½	1.01 " 1.76
1878	1.34	.777	1.252	1.242	1.136	1.126	.952	1.326	1.393	1.39½	.77 " 1.14
1879	1.07	1.108	1.223	.....	1.129	.....	.996	1.252	1.393	1.31½	.81 " 1.33
1880	1.25	.951	1.253	.....	1.213	.....	1.057	1.267	1.480	1.33	.86 " 1.32
1881	1.11	1.193	.....	.....	.....	.....	1.148	1.295	1.509	1.36	.95 " 1.43
1882	1.19	.884	.....	.....	.....	.....	1.166	1.288	1.408	1.35¾	.91 " 1.40
1883	1.13	.910	.....	.....	.....	.....	1.017	1.188	1.306	1.24¾	.90 " 1.13
1884	1.07	.650	.....	.....	.....	.....	.830	1.019	1.059	1.07	.69 " .96
1885	.86	.770	.....	.....	.....	.....	.839	.958	1.016	.98¾	.73 " .91

1886	.87	.687	.....	.....	.....	.....	.766	.886	1.016	.934	.69 " - .84
1887	.89	.681	.....	.....	.....	.....	.756	.929	.987	.97	.66 " .94
1888	.85	.873	.....	.....	.....	.....	.900	.909	1.074	.....	.71 " 2.00
1889	.90	.698	.....	.....	.....	.....	.855	.850	1.016	.....	.75 " 1.08
1890	.83	.838	.....	.....	.....	.....	.892	.912	1.031	.....	.74 " 1.08
1891	.93	.839	.....	.....	.....	.....	.966	1.057	1.161	.....	.85 " 1.16
1892	1.03	.624	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.69 " .91
1893	.80	.539	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.54 " .88
1894	.67	.491	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.50 " 65

a. U. S. Statistical Abstract 1889, p. 313, and of 1894, p. 417—prices in currency.

b. U. S. Statistical Abstract 1886, p, 194, and of 1894, p. 284—average prices in currency in U. S.

c. U. S. Mint Report of 1881, pp. 50 and 51.

d. The Journal of Political Economy, Chicago, December, 1892, p. 157.

e. The Journal of Political Economy, Chicago, December, 1892, p. 158.

f. The Journal of Political Economy, Chicago, December, 1892, p. 158.

g. Taken from Chicago price list published by E. A. Bigelow & Co., and by Howard, Bartels & Co., fractions of cents omitted.

h. The same

a. Average price for the ten years preceding 1859, $1,2[illegible]2.

NOTE.—The tables above given are used as far as they go. When no prices are given, it means the table quoted went no further. One of these tables is for a "fiscal" year, and the others are "calendar" years. It makes a curious study of variations, as one will find by following with his eye each year. While distances and freight explain much, it is not uniform in any sense, and discrepancies and differences occur that are irreconcilable. The main lesson to be learned from statistics is the general average of rise and fall of prices.

Mr. Harvey: Question from S. A. Robinson, New York: "Are not 'the rich' a part of 'the people' of the United States? If not, at what stage of prosperity is citizenship forfeited?"

The American people will be broad enough to understand what I have said in this debate. That a man is rich does not make him in any way less fitted to be a citizen. It is the use of wealth in a way that destroys or mars the fundamental principle of civilization that we object to. (Applause.) When men who are rich go to Washington and secure legislation in favor of the sugar trust by which they make $25,000,000 in sixty days, those men are not fit citizens of the United States. (Applause.) When the money-lenders—the selfish money-lenders, because I want to except the unselfish—are so short-sighted as to ally their interest with the London money-lenders to propagate the principle that they are teaching in this country by which they are forming a "corner" on money, then they are seriously injuring their country and the character of citizenship which will grow up under the conditions they are producing. If one of those men possessing wealth were to turn around and say, "I could live and be happy and prosperous in this country if money-lending were stopped to-morrow," and devote a great part of his wealth to restoring and making perfect civilization in this country, he would be the greatest man in the United States. (Applause.) And he would die probably one of the happiest men that ever lived in the United States. (Applause.) A man can be rich and be a blessing to his country. Wealth does not unfit a man for citizenship: it is how he uses it. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: Question from James H. Teller, Chicago: "If monetary systems are responsible for national

character and standing, as you assumed Tuesday of Mexico and China, must not silver be credited with the modern development and unification of Germany, which, while on a silver basis, humbled Austria, conquered France, and attained intellectual and military pre-eminence in Europe?"

I don't know that in anything I have said I intimated anywhere that the monetary system of any country is responsible alone for the character and standing of that country. I referred to Mexico and China as not having adopted the gold standard, but as living under a silver standard, and I said that under that standard they had not developed. Understand me. I admit that in China silver may be the best money for them to use. In a country where they pay only four to eight cents a day for labor they have to have small coins, and consequently the money of China that the people use is copper. It takes one thousand of their "cash" to make one of our dollars. That may do for a nation of low civilization, where the transactions are small and the people need only small coins. Mexico isn't so much the same, but largely in that way. Mexico pays not one-third for labor what we pay in the United States —not over that. Her transactions are small. Her civilization is low, and consequently she can get along on a silver basis. Now as to Germany having thrashed Austria and conquered France when she was a silver nation—when she did that so were France and Austria silver nations. It was only one silver nation licking another, you know; it didn't prove anything. But they did finally get their eyes open, and every one of them have since changed and are now each of them gold nations. As my friend Harvey says, on Monday you will learn what I believe to be true—that gold is the natural

money for all big transactions of the world; the natural money for all nations that pay high wages and have large transactions; that the civilized world has adopted it because nature fitted it best for the use of civilization, and that it is to-day the money of the civilized world according to the great law of "the survival of the fittest," and if it is, it is in accordance with the law of God Almighty himself, and no squirming individual here on this whole earth can get away from the laws of the Almighty. (Laughter and applause.)

Adjourned to 1 o'clock, Monday, July 29, 1895.

CHAPTER X.

THE NINTH DAY. INDEPENDENT ACTION OF THE UNITED STATES. CLOSING WORDS.

The closing day brought a large crowd to the assembly hall of the Illinois Club. The seats and aisles were filled and hundreds were turned away at the entrance to the building.

The debate proceeded and closed as follows:

MR. HORR: My friend Harvey is peculiarly fortunate, or unfortunate, in his use of figures. All correct figures given by him in this debate when analyzed prove the correctness of my position. The support for his assertion is found alone in incorrect statistics, or statistics which apply to a subject with which they have no relation. Let me illustrate: The only detailed and correct figures which he has presented of American grain prices were given on Thursday for corn in 1872 and 1894. When analyzed they show a per capita decrease for man and beast in the latter year of 25 per cent, and an advance in gold prices of 25 per cent. This corresponds with what Mr. Harvey repeatedly has said is to be expected under normal conditions according to the law of varying supply and demand, and thus proves that silver legislation has not affected corn prices in the United States. When I presented my averages for agricultural products Mr. Harvey said they were misleading, but on the same day he turns around and introduces the tables of Sauerbeck and others, all based

upon averages. Is not "sauce for the goose sauce for the gander"? Mr. Harvey knows that no American tables constructed by averages since 1874 have been or can be presented to prove a marked decline in the price of agricultural staples in the United States, hence he goes to Europe for his figures. They doubtless are correct for that country. They prove nothing for this, any more than they do for the grain raised by the man in the moon. I defy him to produce the table of averages for agricultural prices in America, constructed by himself or any one else, that will show a decline for the whole country since 1875. He challenged my figures Saturday about mortgage debt. I proved his table of debt incorrect to the amount of $2,500,000,000. Here, Brother Harvey, is the table "Extra Census Bulletin, No. 71." I did not present it the other day with a great flourish, as is the wont of some people in a debate of this kind (laughter), and say, "Here is the book." Hence his challenge.

But after challenging my mortgage figures, within ten minutes thereafter friend Harvey proceeded to give some figures relating to tenancy in the United States. He did not produce any government figures; he did read from a newspaper article by a nameless writer. The writer compared the farms worked by tenants and owners in 1880 with farm owners and farm tenants in 1890. The figures used for the two are different as wheat and corn. Such faulty comparisons between different things in different decades causes the increase of farm owners to appear only one-half what it actually was, and makes the increase of farm tenants to be actually twice as great as it was. Where are your government figures for farm tenants? I ask for their production. Mine are in the Abstract of the Last Census, page 64, which I now present.

In his last address relating to city tenancy, Mr. Harvey says, the tenancy in New York city is the largest of—what? Of any place in this country or in the world? You did not state, Brother Harvey. Can you tell me now what you meant?

Mr. Harvey: I didn't say that. I read you the exact language of the Census Bulletin.

Mr. Horr: You are so reported, if you are published correctly. I didn't know what you meant by "greatest."

Mr. Harvey: I read you from the Census Bulletin—I will send to my room and get it.

Mr. Horr: Here it is, the very one. Now, the same paragraph, right in the same paragraph in which you are quoting from, is the tenancy as to the people in Berlin—if you had read the whole paragraph you would have shown the people of this country that while the tenancy in New York is 85.54 per cent, in Berlin it is 95.65 per cent. You have a prejudice against reading the whole of anything, haven't you?

Mr. Harvey: Let me say now, what I read you the other day I now read again from the Census Bulletin. It reads:

"The highest city home tenancy in New York City is represented by 93.67 per cent."

Mr. Horr: Is it 92 or 83?

Mr. Harvey: 93.67, very close to your Berlin quotation. (Laughter.)

Mr. Horr: Very well, very well, don't get fearful about it. (Laughter.) In Berlin, right under, it shows 96.65.

Mr. Harvey: Ten years more and you will have it. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: What I object to is, he is all the while endeavoring by his comparisons to show that this is the

meanest nation on the earth— (Cry of "No" from the audience.) I beg your pardon, I am as capable of judging that as you are. After he had mentioned that, why doesn't he show us what the tenancy in the city was in the next line, and show he was mistaken? Ah, but this is the thing I object to. I did not say anything about the tenancy in big cities: that was not the point. I was replying to a point made by him in his book that farm tenancy was a bad thing and was increasing. City tenancy is an entirely different thing, and I showed the people of this country that the increase of farm tenancy has come entirely from the lower classes who have been working for wages before and—

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr, may I interrupt you?

Mr. Horr: Certainly.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr, didn't I show you that farm tenancy had increased from 25 per cent in 1880 to 34 in 1890?

Mr. Horr: Yes, but you didn't quote it correctly.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, I did.

Mr. Horr: The figures I gave I took right from the report.

Again, in this debate, Mr. Harvey, you stated that the number of the unemployed at present was from three to four million. The numbers astounded me. I could hardly believe my eyes when I saw his statement. I looked in his book "Up To Date," and I found the same statement, from three to four million, and he gives as authority Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor.

I know Mr. Wright is a pretty reliable old man, and it didn't seem to me possible that he could have authorized such a statement. My friend Powers knew him well, and so I thought we could find out whether there was anything true about that. We wrote him to find out what he had based the figures upon which had

given Mr. Harvey such marvelous information. He answers by telegram: "Absence prevented my reply, but you are at liberty to say that no such statement as that quoted by Mr. Harvey ever came from me." (Applause.)

It is that kind of work to which I object, in order to smirch the people of the United States. These little inaccuracies are of little account, however, in this debate. We are discussing a great question, and now to-day we come down to the gist of this whole business. The question is, Can this nation alone establish the old ratio of 16 to 1 and maintain it among the nations of the world?

Mr. Harvey: I think the only fact that I used in any of my books without confirming it was the quotation from Carroll D. Wright. It had been made in print as coming from him, and I asked some labor leaders if I could rely on it. They said I could; but after using it, and the first edition of the book was off, that was "Up To Date," I went to work to find out myself if he had said it, and on getting the information direct from Mr. Wright that he had not, I had it erased from the plates, and the book does not now appear with that in it. (Applause.) I think any man writing upon this subject should be exact. Errors will creep in in spite of all caution, but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you will find that when a sincere writer is writing, the error does not affect the principle. Typographical errors will get in. When you add to the unemployed in this country those who are working only half time and for the other half time unemployed, you have got more than four million.

Before beginning the debate proper to-day, I desire to say something. In all history in the struggle between liberty and oppression, as they have alternately

risen and fallen, it has been truthfully said that a free press is the greatest bulwark of liberty, and tyranny has regarded it as the greatest influence arrayed against it. As oppression rises, the press is muzzled. It is bought up and made to speak deceit and mislead the people. In view of that I desire to extend public recognition in this debate to the *Chicago Inter Ocean* and the *Chicago Morning Record* (applause) as representatives of a press that is yet untrammeled in America. Every newspaper should have as its motto in this country:

> "Here the press the people's rights maintain,
> Unawed by influence and unbribed by gain."

I wish to say further that I desire to express my appreciation for assistance in this debate to Howard S. Taylor, my referee; to Judge Henry G. Miller, George E. Bowen, G. L. McKean, F. J. Schulte, A. H. Lockwood, Earl Marble, Samuel Leavitt, George H. Shibley, C. B. Pash, John A. Grier and my faithful secretary, Josie E. Hix. (Applause.) They have made my work light and pleasant. I will not undertake to mention those from without the city who have come here in numbers and encouraged me. To undertake to mention them would cause me to omit some, as they are numerous, but I know they will pardon me when I say that Mr. William H. Farrell of Leavenworth, Kansas, has placed in my pocket as a gift from him a dollar of the same date as that which I gave Mr. Horr on Saturday. (Applause.)

In beginning the debate to-day, I hand to the stenographer a table from pages 184 to 186 of the Mint Report for 1892, of the gold and silver coined in this country from 1792 to 1873, and make it a part of the debate.

COINAGE OF THE MINTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

GOLD COINAGE.

Year.	Double Eagles.	Eagles.	Half Eagles.	Three Dollars.	Quarter Eagles.	Dollars.
1793-1795	......	$ 27,950	$ 43,535	......	......	......
1796	......	60,800	16,995	......	165.00	......
1797	......	91,770	32,030	......	4,390.00	......
1798	......	79,740	124,335	......	1,535.00	......
1799	......	174,830	37,255	......	1,200.00	......
1800	......	259,650	58,110	......	......	......
1801	......	292,540	130,030	......	......	......
1802	......	150,900	265,880	......	6,530.00	......
1803	......	89,790	167,530	......	1,057.50	......
1804	......	97,950	152,375	......	8,317.50	......
1805	......	......	165,915	......	4,452.50	......
1806	......	......	320,465	......	4,040.00	......
1807	......	......	420,465	......	17,030.00	......
1808	......	......	277,890	......	6,775.00	......
1809	......	......	169,375	......	......	......
1810	......	......	501,435	......	......	......
1811	......	......	497,905	......	......	......
1812	......	......	290,435	......	......	......
1813	......	......	477,140	......	......	......
1814	......	......	77,270	......	......	......
1815	......	......	3,175	......	......	......
1816	......	......	......	......	......	......
1817	......	......	......	......	......	......
1818	......	......	242,940	......	......	......
1819	......	......	258,615	......	......	......
1820	......	......	1,319,030	......	......	......
1821	......	......	173,205	......	16,120.00	......
1822	......	......	88,980	......	......	......
1823	......	......	72,425	......	......	......
1824	......	......	86,700	......	6,500.00	......
1825	......	......	145,300	......	11,085.00	......
1826	......	......	90,345	......	1,900.00	......
1827	......	......	124,565	......	7,000.00	......
1828	......	......	140,145	......	......	......
1829	......	......	287,210	......	8,507.50	......
1830	......	......	631,755	......	11,350.00	......
1831	......	......	702,970	......	11,300.00	......
1832	......	......	787,435	......	11,000.00	......
1833	......	......	968,150	......	10,400.00	......
1884	......	......	3,660,845	......	293,425.00	......
1835	......	......	1,857,670	......	328,505.00	......
1836	......	......	2,765,735	......	1,369,965.00	......
1837	......	......	1,035,605	......	112,700.00	......
1838	......	72,000	1,600,420	......	137,345.00	......
1839	......	382,480	802,745	......	191,622.50	......
1840	......	473,380	1,048,580	......	153,572.50	......
1841	......	656,310	380,945	......	54,602.50	......
1842	......	1,089,070	655,330	......	85,007.50	......
1843	......	2,506,240	4,275,425	......	1,327,132.50	......
1844	......	1,250,610	4,087,715	......	89,345.00	......
1845	......	736,530	2,743,640	......	276,277.50	......

Year.	Double Eagles.	Eagles.	Half Eagles.	Three Dollars.	Quarter Eagles.	Dollars.
1846.......	....	1,018,750	2,736,155	....	279,272.50	....
1847.......	....	14,337,580	5,382,685	....	482,060.00	....
1848.......	....	1,813,340	1,863,560	....	98,612.50	....
1849.......	....	6,775,180	1,184,645	....	111,147.50	$ 936,789
1850.......	$26,225,220	3,489,510	860,160	....	895,547.50	511,301
1851.......	48,043,100	4,393,280	2,651,955	....	3,867,337.50	3,658,820
1852.......	44,860,520	2,811,060	3,689,635	....	3,283,827.50	2,201,145
1853.......	26,646,520	2,522,530	2,305,095	....	3,519,615.00	4,384,149
1854.......	18,052,340	2,305,760	1,513,235	$491,214	1,896,397.50	1,657,016
1855.......	25,046,820	1,487,010	1,257,090	171,465	600,700.00	824,883
1856.......	30,437,560	1,429,900	1,806,665	181,530	1,213,117.50	1,788,996
1857.......	28,797,500	481,060	1,232,970	104,673	796,235.00	801,602
1858.......	21,873,480	343,210	439,770	6,399	144,082.50	131,472
1859.......	13,782,840	253,930	361,235	46,914	142,220.00	193,431
1860.......	22,584,400	278,830	352,365	42,465	164,360.00	51,234
1861.......	74,989,060	1,287,330	3,332,130	18,216	3,241,295.00	527,499
1862.......	18,926,120	234,950	69,825	17,355	300,882.50	1,326,865
1863.......	22,187,200	112,480	97,360	15,117	27,075.00	6,250
1864.......	19,958,900	60,800	40,540	8,040	7,185.00	5,950
1865.......	27,874,000	207,050	144,535	3,495	62,302.50	1,326,865
1866.......	30,820,500	237,800	253,200	12,090	105,175.00	7,180
1867.......	23,436,300	121,400	179,600	7,950	78,125.00	5,250
1868.......	18,722,000	241,550	288,625	14,625	94,062.50	10,525
1869.......	17,228,100	82,850	163,925	7,575	84,612.50	5,925
1870.......	22,819,480	164,430	143,550	10,605	51,387.50	9,335
1871.......	20,456,740	254,650	245,000	3,990	68,375.00	3,930
1872.......	21,230,600	244,500	275,350	6,090	52,575.00	3,530

(Pages 184 and 186, Report of the Director of the Mint, 1892.)

SILVER COINAGE.

Calendar Years.	Dollars.	Half Dollars.	Quarter Dollars.	Dimes.	Half Dimes.
1793-1795......	$ 204,791	$ 161,572.00	....	....	$ 4,320.80
1796..........	72,920	....	$ 1,473.50	2,213.50	511.50
1797..........	7,776	1,959.00	63.00	2,526.10	2,226.35
1798..........	327,536	....	....	2,755.00	....
1799..........	423,515	....	....	....	....
1800..........	220,920	....	....	2,176.00	1,200.00
1801..........	54,454	15,144.50	....	3,464.00	1,695.50
1802..........	41,650	14,945.00	....	1,097.50	650.50
1803..........	66,064	15,857.50	....	3,304.00	1,892.50
1804..........	19,570	78,259.50	1,684.50	826.50	....
1805..........	321	105,861.00	30,348.50	12,078.00	780.00
1806..........	....	419,788.00	51,531.00	....	....
1807..........	....	525,788.00	55,160.75	16,500.00	....
1808..........	....	684,300.00	....	....	....
1809..........	....	702,905.00	....	4,471.00	....
1810..........	....	638,138.00	....	635.50	....
1811..........	....	601,822.00	....	6,518.00	....
1812..........	....	814,029.50	....	....	....
1813..........	....	620,951.50	....	....	....
1814..........	....	519,537.50	....	42,150.00	....
1815..........	....	....	17,308.00	....	....

Calendar Years.	Dollars.	Half Dollars.	Quarter Dollars.	Dimes.	Half Dimes.
1816...........	....	23,575.00	5,000.75	....	....
1817...........	....	607,783.50	....	....	....
1818...........	....	980,161.00	90,293.50	....	....
1819...........	....	1,104,000.00	36,000.00	....	....
1820...........	....	375,561.00	31,861.00	94,258.70	....
1821...........	....	652,898.50	54,212.75	118,651.20	....
1822...........	....	779,786.50	16,020.00	10,000.00	....
1823...........	....	847,100.00	4,450.00	44,000.00	....
1824...........	....	1,752,477.00	....	....	....
1825...........	....	1,471,583.00	42,000.00	51,000.00	....
1826...........	....	2,002,090.00	....	....	....
1827...........	....	2,746,700.00	1,000.00	121,500.00	....
1828...........	....	1,537,600.00	25,500.00	12,500.00	....
1829...........	....	1,856,078.00	....	77,000.00	61,500.00
1830...........	....	2,382,400.00	....	51,000.00	62,000.00
1831...........	....	2,936,830.00	99,500.00	77,135.00	62,135.00
1832...........	....	2,398,500.00	80,000.00	52,250.00	48,250.00
1833...........	....	2,603,000.00	39,000.00	48,500.00	68,500.00
1834...........	....	3,206,002.00	71,500.00	63,500.00	74,000.00
1835...........	....	2,676,003.00	488,000.00	141,000.00	138,000.00
1836...........	1,000	3,273,100.00	118,000.00	119,000.00	95,000.00
1837...........	....	1,814,910.00	63,100.00	104,200.00	113,800.00
1838...........	....	1,773,000.00	208,000.00	239,493.40	112,750.00
1839...........	300	1,748,768.00	122,786.50	229,638.70	108,285.00
1840...........	61,005	1,145,054.00	153,331.75	253,358.00	113,954.25
1841...........	173,000	355,500.00	143,000.00	363,000.00	98,250.00
1842...........	184,618	1,484,882.00	214,250.00	390,750.00	58,250.00
1843...........	165,100	3,056,000.00	403,400.00	152,000.00	58,250.00
1844...........	20,000	1,885,500.00	290,300.00	7,250.00	32,500.00
1845...........	24,500	1,341,500.00	230,500.00	198,500.00	78,200.00
1846...........	169,600	2,257,000.00	127,500.00	3,130.00	1,350.00
1847...........	140,750	1,870,000.00	275,500.00	24,500.00	63,700.00
1848...........	15,000	1,880,000.00	36,500.00	45,150.00	63,400.00
1849...........	62,600	1,781,000.00	85,000.00	113,900.00	72,450.00
1850...........	47,500	1,341,500.00	150,700.00	244,150.00	82,250.00
1851...........	1,300	301,375.00	62,000.00	142,650.00	82,050.00
1852...........	1,100	110,565.00	68,265.00	196,550.00	63,025.00
1853...........	46,110	2,430,354.00	4,146,555.00	1,327,301.00	785,251.00
1854...........	33,140	4,111,000.00	3,466,000.00	624,000.00	365,000.00
1855...........	26,000	2,288,725.00	857,350.00	207,500.00	117,500.00
1856...........	63,500	1,903,500.00	2,129,500.00	703,000.00	299,000.00
1857...........	94,000	1,482,000.00	2,726,500.00	712,000.00	433,000.00
1858...........	....	5,998,000.00	2,002,250.00	189,000.00	258,000.00
1859...........	636,500	2,074,000.00	421,000.00	97,000.00	45,000.00
1860...........	733,930	1,032,850.00	312,350.00	78,700.00	92,950.00
1861...........	78,500	2,078,950.00	1,237,650.00	209,650.00	164,050.00
1862...........	12,090	802,175.00	249,887.50	102,830.00	74,627.50
1863...........	27,660	709,830.00	48,015.00	17,196.00	5,923.00
1864...........	31,170	518,785.00	28,517.50	26,907.00	4,523.50
1865...........	47,000	593,450.00	25,075.00	18,550.00	6,675.00
1866...........	49,625	899,812.50	11,381.25	14,372.50	6,536.25
1867...........	60,325	810,162.50	17,156.25	14,662.50	6,431.25
1868...........	182,700	769,100.00	31,500.00	72,625.00	18,295.00
1869...........	424,300	725,950.00	23,150.00	70,660.00	21,930.00
1870...........	445,462	829,758.50	23,935.00	52,150.00	26,830.00
1871...........	1,117,136	1,741,655.00	53,255.50	109,371.00	82,493.00
1872...........	1,118,600	866,775.00	68,762.50	261,045.00	189,247.50

I do this to remove the representation that has gone all over the country that for the first half of the century we were on a silver basis, and from 1850 to 1873 we were on a gold basis. The best answer to that argument is the production of the table of coins themselves. The statement that gold did not seek the mints for the first fifty years and that silver did not seek the mints for the last thirty years prior to 1873 is not true.

GOLD AND SILVER OF THE WORLD.

Page 130 of the United States Coinage Laws Appendix and Statistics 1894—I now hand the book to Mr. Horr —gives the approximate stock of money in the world. The stock of gold there given is $3,901,900,000; the stock of silver there given is $3,931,300,000. This estimate includes gold and silver coins and gold and silver bullion available for coinage into money. I have given it to you as expressed in dollars. As expressed in space or bulk there is, if each were melted into a solid mass, the cube of 22 feet of gold and the cube of 66 feet of silver. In chapter five of "Coin's Financial School" you are told how to make this calculation. But it is sufficient in this debate that we deal with these two metals as expressed in dollars.

The quantity of these two metals available for coinage into money is what is left after the demand for them in the arts and manufactures is supplied. As civilization has grown the use in arts and manufactures of these metals has grown out of proportion to the increase in population.

As we became a manufacturing people, ingenuity began to devise all kinds of ornamental and useful things made wholly or in part from these metals to be paraded in the markets to induce people to buy them. We thus

went to making numerous articles to sell for money, out of the material from which money was made.

As we have here to deal principally with the question as to whether there is a sufficient quantity of gold in the world to supply the quantity of money necessary, I shall direct your attention more directly to that metal.

USE OF GOLD IN THE ARTS.

Our very first step should be to the subject of the use of gold in the arts. We thus see that this increased use to which I have called your attention has a direct bearing on the quantity of our money supply to be derived from gold.

Edward Suess, Professor of Geology at the University of Vienna, in a book that I hold in my hand, has compiled exhaustive information on this subject. I will read you a few facts he gives that will be educational to you and will then give you the conclusions he draws:

"In 1890, according to the reports of Mr. Leach, the mints of the United States and the private refining works furnished to industry gold bars of the value of $14,605,901; but aside from this, the goldsmiths are in the habit of melting down a quantity, not accurately known, of gold coins. Formerly, according to the information gathered in four different years, this amount was estimated at $3,500,000. If no decrease has occurred in this employment of coin, says Mr. Leach, then the value of the gold consumed in industry in the United States in the calendar year 1890 has been $18,105,901."

IN DEFENSE OF THE PRESS.

MR. HORR: I desire to say just a word in defense of the press of the country. I have not a word to say against the action of the *Record* and the *Inter Ocean*

nor any of the other papers here in the city. Some of them have treated me well, and some of them have treated me as they saw fit. I had one paper thrust in my face at the door of this building with a column of belittling remarks about me that were very cutting; but when I came to read the head-lines of five or six articles in the same paper and found that the fellow favored free coinage of silver only because it was a step to break down all the laws of the country—when I read in the paper until I found out that it was the worst kind of an anarchistic sheet, I threw it to one side. I was glad he abused me. I do not seek the applause, in this world, of that kind of people.

But when you come to the great American press as a whole I have no fault to find with it. They do not always estimate me according to my estimate of myself (laughter), but they may be right and I may be wrong. As a rule the insinuation that the leading press of this country can be bought up for the purpose of producing legislation in the interests of any particular people against the great interests of the citizens of the United States, I do not believe. I believe there is as much honor and integrity among the men who manage the great newspapers of this country as there is in the same number of men doing any other business in the United States.

It will be a good while before you will get me into a state of mind so that I am compelled to make out that the great bulk of any class of American citizens are a set of vagabonds. I am an American citizen myself and believe in this country, and I think, take it as a whole, we average up as well as the people of any other country on the face of the earth. I sometimes get the "big head," and think we are a little better, you know.

(Laughter.) Believing that, I never indulge in this kind of talk about people acting from corrupt motives.

I had just started to show that no nation alone can establish the old ratio of 16 to 1. I state now that I do not believe Mr. Harvey thinks any one nation can do it—at least he does not propose to keep that ratio. He says in his book, "They say it is not bimetallism unless the two metals stay at exactly the parity of 16 to 1. These men do not know what bimetallism is. It may be desirable to let one metal go, as it would be now with both as primary money. We may have bimetallism and bimetallic prices, whether one metal has a tendency to leave us more than the other or not, and if desirable to stop this leaving a change in the ratio will do it, and if necessary we can do it so as to set the other metal going so that we can feed Europe either metal we may choose."

So he is not a stickler for 16 to 1 at all.

VALUES NOT FIXED BY LAW.

Now I start out with this proposition. Nations by their laws do not fix the value of things. They cannot do it if they try. The actual value of the two metals at the present time is wide apart. The ratio of 16 to 1 is to-day a thing of the past; the value of the two metals in the markets of the world has changed. How it happened to have been done, what brought it about, does not bear upon this question to-day. The figures 16 to 1 do not represent the commercial value of the two to-day. Nobody claims they do.

Always, from the earliest foundation of society, the relative value between gold and silver has been fixed by the people of the world, and not by legislation. That is a fixed fact. They have never been able legally to determine any ratio and have it remain permanent.

The tables that Mr. Harvey has produced show that nothing like it was ever accomplished. The people determine the kind of metal they desire, and they use that; and desire is demand, it is the foundation of demand.

Consequently it is useless to talk about fixing a comparative ratio between any two substances by legislation. Is there a man living who thinks all the nations in the world combined could fix a ratio of value between a bushel of wheat and a bushel of oats? Try it on. You will see where you will land. If you have a small crop of wheat and a large crop of oats, or a small crop of oats and a large crop of wheat, up will go your ratio, and law has no more effect on it than it has to make water run up hill instead of down. Does any one think that by passing an act you could stay the floods of Niagara and make them run up stream? Why not? Well, there is a little difficulty in the way. The law of gravitation stands between you and the accomplishment of such an act. Consequently the same thing occurs when you come to the ratio between any two articles. They are determined by conditions over which legislators have no control.

Now, Mr. Harvey and I both agree that the free coinage of silver will decrease the measure of value used here in this country. He don't deny that. The burden of his whole talk in this debate is that we ought to have a cheaper measure; that the unit is worth too much. So now we agree that it will change the measure. Mr. Harvey says, then, that is what ought to be done, because, he says, the whole world is in debt, and our country is on the brink of ruin, because the present dollar is too valuable. That is his position. That is a position on which I differ with him.

He proposes to relieve the distress of the people by letting them pay what they owe in cheaper money. I know I do not misrepresent you in that respect, Mr. Harvey. I answer him, "No, the debts of the day, the bulk of them, have been contracted with the gold dollar as the measure, and to relieve the payment of them in any way by a trick of this kind is repudiation." It is repudiation for all debts contracted recently anyhow, because both parties, the borrower and the lender, should always use the same measure. It would be dishonest if a man had one bushel measure to buy the produce of the farms with, and had a good deal smaller one which he used when he sold articles. You know we would make it hot for a man that would try that on if we found it out here in this world. The measure should always be the one used and understood by both parties.

He answers me by saying, "I agree with you, the unit of values should be used by both parties, the same," but he says, "For twenty-two years your unit has been increasing in value, and silver has remained stable."

MR. HARVEY: When I reach Mr. Horr's argument as to legislation not controlling the value of gold and silver, my answer I think will be satisfactory. I now continue reading from Professor Suess:

HOW GOLD IS CONSUMED.

"In 1877 I was enabled through the kindness of the Secretary's office of the Chamber of Commerce of Birmingham, to state the consumption of gold in that city at 250,000 to 300,000 ounces. This did not include gilding and gold leaf."

The manager of the refining works in Geneva wrote to Mr. Suess as follows:

"Relying on our sales and on the figures of the federal control, I estimate the demand of Switzerland in 1890 at 14,000 to 15,000 kilograms of alloyed gold; that is to say, about 9,800 kilograms of fine gold. Of this I estimate that seven-ninths went to the watch industry, and two-ninths into jewelry. For silver on the same basis in the same year the demand would have been 60,000 kilograms of fine silver, which was entirely taken up by the watch industry. For 1891 I estimate the demand for alloyed gold in Switzerland at 9,000 kilograms, that is to say, about 5,900 kilograms of fine gold, 7,000 kilograms being for watches and 2,000 kilograms for ornaments. Silver would amount to 52,000 to 55,000 kilograms, entirely for the watch industry."

Mr. Suess sums up all the information he has acquired, as follows:

"But if this figure is compared with the figure of the total production of 168,000 kilograms in round numbers for 1890, or 177,000 kilograms for 1891" (the figures he has obtained), "it seems to me very probable that the demand for ornament, for industry, and for hoarding, is close to the figure of production, or has already reached it."

I now hand this book to Mr. Horr.

Here in the United States we produce a little more gold than we use in the arts, but the portion left for use as money is growing less. On page 102 of the book on Coinage Laws, etc., heretofore referred to, you get the annual gold product of the United States. On page 455 of the same book, you get the gold furnished by the mints to be used in the arts and manufactures for the years 1880 to 1892 inclusive. I put these two together, and here is the result. I hand this table to the stenographer to be inserted in the report:

PRODUCTION OF GOLD IN THE UNITED STATES AND AMOUNT USED IN THE ARTS FOR THE YEARS 1860-1892.

Years.	Production	Used in Arts
1880	$36,000,000	$10,962,600
1881	34,700.000	11,770,700
1882	32,500,000	10,868,000
1883	30,000,000	14,458,800
1884	30,800,000	14,500,000
1885	31,800,000	11,824,742
1886	35,000,000	13,069,529
1887	33,000,000	14,810,346
1888	33,175,000	16,514,842
1889	32,800,000	16,697,056
1890	32,845,000	17,655,960
1891	33,175,000	19,686,916
1892	33,000,000	19,329,074

We thus see that while we produced of gold $36,000,000 in 1880, we produced only $33,000,000 in 1892, with population larger and necessity for gold greater than at the latter period.

But the comparison is more serious when you notice what is left for use as money at the latter period as compared with the former.

In 1880 there was left for coinage, after deducting what was used in the arts, $25,000,000; while in 1892 less than $14,000,000 was left. This estimate does not include the $3,500,000 before estimated as melted up in the coins by manufacturers, and does not include gold lost by hoarding, accident, fire, or abrasion.

We have seen that the supply of silver in 1894 available for use as money was $3,931,100,000. (See page 130 "Coinage Laws and Statistics" for the figures I am about to read.)

$950,000,000 of this silver is in use as money in India;

$725,000,000 in China;

$88,000,000 in Mexico, Central and South America;

$81,300,000 in Japan;

$110,000,000 in the Straits.

The remainder, or about $1,900,000,000, is in use as token money or occupying the quasi position of limping bimetallism in the other nations of the world. The larger part of this is divided as follows:

United States	$624,000,000
United Kingdom	112,000,000
France	500,000,000
Germany	215,000,000
Spain	155,000,000

And the remainder among the smaller nations of the earth. The foregoing figures are all coinage value in our dollars.

A natural inquiry is, what becomes of the silver we are producing? I quote from an interview with G. H. Gibson, a prominent New York stock broker who has just returned from London, in *The Chicago Post*, a gold-standard paper, of the 8th inst.:

"I talked with Sir Hector M. Hay, a member of the firm doing the largest bullion business in the world. In reply to a direct inquiry as to how much silver bullion he regarded as existing in the market in Europe, he stated his belief that the visible supply in Europe did not exceed £3,000,000 sterling.

"Sir Charles Freemantle, the master of the British mint on Tower Hill, told me five years ago that there was no stock of silver bullion to speak of in Europe. It came by every steamer and went away by every steamer. On inquiry of one of the highest statistical authorities in London, the fact was confirmed that despite the demonetization of silver by all of the great nations, including India, the use of silver in the arts has grown so wonderfully that there is a ridiculously small supply in the market at any one time."

The production of silver in the United States last year was bullion value $40,000,000, and we exported

bullion value $37,164,713. Thus there was a demand in the balance of the world for substantially all of our silver. These are the facts, and this is the situation before us as we begin the argument for independent action of the United States.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

Let me first sound a few principles:

The more costly either of these metals becomes, the greater the demand for it among the rich for use as ornaments.

Where the dearer is used exclusively for primary money, it is the one that is hoarded.

When gold and silver were both used as money in their own right, silver was hoarded by the plain people, and was brought forth to serve them in time of need.

Gold is principally hoarded by the rich to serve a purpose in bulling the money market.

Hoarding of silver by the people was beneficial; hoarding of gold is an injury. The cause of hoarding in the two instances is different. In the first instance it is to serve a natural law providing for the future; in the second instance it is a commercial motive affecting injuriously the community.

This is one of the reasons why silver has always proven the more stable money.

Gold is not regular in production. I here hand the stenographer a table showing the production of gold for the world for the years 1849 to 1892, taken from page 103 "Coinage Laws and Statistics," to be here inserted:

PRODUCTION OF GOLD FOR THE WORLD.

Year.	Amount.	Year.	Amount.
1849	37,000,000	1871	107,000,000
1850	44,450,000	1872	99,600,000
1851	67,600,000	1873	96,200,000
1852	132,750,000	1874	90,750,000
1853	155,450,000	1875	97,500,000
1854	127,450,000	1876	103,700,000
1855	135,075,000	1877	114,000,000
1856	147,600,000	1878	119,000,000
1857	133,275,000	1879	109,000,000
1858	124,650,000	1880	106,500,000
1859	124,850,000	1881	103,000,000
1860	119,250,000	1882	102,000,000
1861	113,800,000	1883	95,400,000
1862	107,750,000	1884	101,700,000
1863	106,950,000	1885	108,400,000
1864	113,000,000	1886	106,000,000
1865	120,200,000	1887	105,775,000
1866	121,100,000	1888	110,197,000
1867	104,025,000	1889	123,489,000
1868	109,025,000	1890	118,849,000
1869	106,225,000	1891	126,184,000
1870	106,850,000	1892	138,860,000

It will be seen that the world produced more gold in the year 1853 than it has in any year since then. With increasing population and increasing demand for gold there has been no increase in the annual supply since 1853. If we go back of 1849 (see the table heretofore introduced), the irregularity is more marked.

The production of the two metals combined is more regular than either separately, and is safer to rely on for a stable money measurement of values than either could be separately.

Where two metals are relied on for money, with the right of the debtor to pay in either, if the demand for money is sufficient this demand regulates the commercial value of the two metals at the ratio fixed by law. Supply and demand affect the value of these metals the same as all other property.

When the law bestows the full function of money upon these metals, it creates a use for them that they

did not before have. (Applause.) A new use to an article adds to its value. The new use of corn for making glucose, candy and molasses has increased its value. The extent to which corn can be supplied is virtually unlimited, and, with other farm productions unprofitable, the corn crop will increase, and the price will drop.

In the case of the two metals we are considering, they differ from corn in this: The use of these metals for money, when given full money functions, is comparatively unlimited. The supply, unlike corn, is limited. Their geological formation, and the experience of mankind in their search therefor and development, prove this. The abnormal demand for money in all ages, now at a tension, the fact that tens of thousands of men are continually searching for the metal from which it is made, and the further fact that all that is now in existence outside of useful articles and ornaments can, if melted down, be put into three rooms of this building, prove conclusively that the supply is limited.

We can therefore better understand the effect to be produced by the United States throwing open its mints to silver and conferring upon that metal the full functions of money when I shall reach it directly.

Mr. Horr: Before I refer to what I was talking about before, I want to call Mr. Harvey's attention to the ridiculous nonsense of his comparing size as having something to do with value. His cube business—that may deceive a little boy, but it never would deceive a full-grown man. Indeed a man who has ever thought on the subject would never use such a comparison. I state it deliberately, the amount of gold in the world all put into a cube hasn't anything to do with how much it is worth. You could not get the cotton into

fifty times or five hundred thousand times the same space. Cotton isn't any more available on that account. You are trying to make a comparison—a trouble that seems constitutional with you—of comparing things that are not alike with each other, and when a man does that he is always in the wrong. I just simply give it out as a hint to you to improve yourself on after the debate is over. (Applause.)

DEBTS MOSTLY OF RECENT ORIGIN.

I was just saying that the bulk of the debts of the present day are of recent origin. Very largely the debts of the common people are less than one year old. The debts which have been contracted a long time ago, and which run for a series of years, are as a rule all of them the debts of rich corporations. They are long-bonded debts and the most of them are made to-day payable in gold, and the legislation he is talking about will in no way affect those debts. The debts we are talking about are the debts owed by the people of the United States. It is the business of the present that we want to examine into here to-day.

Now there is no disguising the issue between us, it is simply this: Can we benefit the people of this republic now by making a dollar mean about half as much as it now means? Can we benefit them by making it seem any considerable amount less than it now is, by making it actually less in value? We may disguise it as much as we will, the free coinage of silver on a ratio of 16 to 1 means silver monometallism. It means that the business of this country shall be done with silver alone, and that gold shall disappear from the money of this nation. Nobody doubts that; that is, I don't think there is a man in the United States that will dispute that proposition for a moment—

that the first result of such a law will be to drive the gold out of this country. Now where will we land? I don't care whether he admits it or not, it don't make any difference to me, I know we will be as free from the use of gold as Mexico is, as China is. Neither of them use a dollar of gold as coin money; they buy it and sell it in both countries at a large premium, and we will do that the next morning after we pass Mr. Harvey's law. Hence, the question is a vital one. Who will be injured and who will be benefited by scaling down all debts, by making our measure of value cheaper? It is the old question—a very, very old one. Can you bless a people by clipping the coins? They used to think we could. Monarchs used to indulge in it. Men away back in early days had the idea that by clipping a coin, as long as they could call it by the same name and have it pass, they injured no one. It took ages of business sense to drive the people of the world out of that notion, until they have finally come to understand that there is nothing you must watch more carefully than to have honesty in your money, have the dollar just what it claims to be. Such efforts have always ended and always will end in robbing the mass of the people. Whenever you change the value of money by any device which cheapens the unit of measure and lessens the price of the coin in use and compels people to take it at the old price, then you rob the common people of any nation, and the profit has usually gone into the pockets, not of money-lenders, but of money-changers. That is the history of the world.

WHOM WILL FREE COINAGE BENEFIT?

Now I come to the practical question: Who in the United States will be benefited by giving them cheap

dollars for the good ones they now receive? I first say our census arranges the toilers of the American people under different subdivisions. The first heading I find here is professional men—lawyers, doctors, preachers, editors, writers of books, men who toil at any kind of public work, musicians, teachers—will you call them on to the stand, Mr. Harvey, ask them what they have to give to the world to show why they should have a right to live in it? There is no more foolish doctrine ever uttered by human beings than that the world owes everybody a living. The world owes everybody a living if he will honestly earn one in the world. It does not owe a living to a lazy lout who won't do anything in order to get a living. It doesn't owe him one. (Applause.) Understand that. What have these men to give? Why, they say, we have human effort. We have spent long years in preparing to do a high grade of work. The doctor says, "I can heal the sick." The preacher, "I can heal the soul." The lawyer says, "I can do good work in settling disputes and adjusting difficulties between my fellow-men." The musician says, "I can give a high order of amusement to my fellow-beings." We pay such men, always, a higher price, because their work ought to be worth more—work that has taken years to get ready to do. We even pay men sometimes for genius. A man is born with a gift to do great things, and when he does them the world recognizes it, and gives the big pay in return. Perhaps that is why your book sold so well, Brother Harvey. (Laughter and applause.)

Now I ask the army of professionals, Do you think it would benefit you to cut down the price of the dollar in which you are paid? They are all paid in money for their work. Will you be better off by getting just the

same number of dollars but having them worth just half as much? "Well," they say, "we don't want you to submit that proposition to us. We fellows that have studied so that we have got a little bit of gray matter so that it is somewhat active in our brains—you don't want to ask us whether we will be benefited by making us think we are getting the old pay when we are only getting half as much." Would they vote no? No doubt about it. They say we want the best money, the money that will buy the most of the comforts and the necessities of life. Aren't they right about that? There are of those people, Mr. Harvey, 944,343. The census is right here, and if you are afraid of me you watch the book a little as I go on.

I next call up those engaged in trades and transportation. That includes all the railroad hands, all the steamboat hands. That includes all the people who work in different trades. Typewriters, men and women, they have cultivated themselves so they can do good work, and the world pays them for it. The brakemen—it includes people who take risks.

Mr. Harvey: I wish I had time in this debate to characterize the last speech of Mr. Horr as it deserves, but I can only stop now to say that when I said that all the gold and silver in the world available for money could be put into three rooms in this building, I knew it would make Mr. Horr wince. The statement that all the gold in the world available for money can be put in the space of twenty-two feet is one of the arguments that worries him the most. It is an object lesson, and if Mr Horr were on our side of this case, with his inimitable wit and sarcasm, he would go around with a picture, a twenty-two foot block on canvas, and he would have it on every stage where he spoke, and he

would ridicule the gold gamblers of the world until he would satisfy his audience that the man who would advocate that that twenty-two foot block should supply the people of the world with primary money had a soul in him no larger than a mustard-seed. (Applause.) Mr. Horr, the people of this country have common sense, and when they see that all the gold in the world available for money can go into twenty-two feet of space you have given them the best argument in the world to show that the Rothschilds can corner it in their bank vaults. (Applause.) If the people of this country will only rest their cause always upon common-sense principles, and let this sophistry, that is fed us from the other side, alone, our liberties are safe. He talks about clipped coins. Who clipped the coins in 1873? (Applause.) Who started the world upon the robber measure of values of 1873? (Applause.) And now the very men who have destroyed the value of your property, confiscated your property, robbed you of your rights, including happiness itself, now turn around to you and talk about clipping coins. (Applause.) Mr. Horr, you have in your pocket as a gift from me an honest dollar. (Applause.) A sound dollar. Take it from the people of the great west as a message to the people of the east of what our interpretation is of a good, a sound, an honest dollar. (Applause.) It is that dollar that we want re-coined again as primary money of the country, and not a clipped coin.

GOLD OBLIGATIONS UNDER FREE COINAGE.

I want to speak now of this: There is great concern among some of our citizens that if free coinage of silver is adopted those holding gold obligations will be paid in silver, also that gold will leave us, and a debtor who

owes gold will not be able to get it without paying a high premium in order to discharge his debt. Both of these questions can be answered together. Gold obligations would be paid in gold, and not in silver. To secure the gold with which to do this would not be so difficult as it is now. It would operate this way:

As soon as the United States opens its mints and confers on silver the full functions of money with the right to no one thereafter to make a debt payable in gold (for under the bimetallic law there would be no such right, debts thereafter would be payable in either metal), the demand for gold would be withdrawn except to pay previous debts thus payable. When you withdraw the demand in such a pronounced way from an article, it must decline in value. (Applause.) With the demand thus suddenly thrown on silver to supply the United States with money, its value would rapidly advance. (Applause.) You have suddenly transferred the demand from one metal to the other. One must necessarily decline, and the other advance relatively. Hence, you could buy the gold cheaper then than now. (Applause.) Gold is now at a premium of one hundred per cent over silver. In exchanging your property for gold now, you are paying in property 100 per cent premium over what you did in 1873.

Suppose on silver coming into use as primary money that gold went to a premium of 25 per cent. I do not admit this, but state the hypothesis to allay your fears. You would then exchange your property for more gold than you do now. Gold must decline in value when the United States, yet the greatest nation on earth, goes out of the market for gold. To withdraw demand from an article lowers its value, is a law of trade that all men must admit, and no man can contradict. Hence

you will then exchange your property for more gold than you can now. The debtor will pay his gold debt easier then than he can now.

When the proposition is made that free coinage of silver will send gold to a premium, and make it harder for you to pay a debt, you are misled by the manner in which the proposition is put. Premium over what? Premium over silver is meant. Silver would be in that event the medium of exchange through which you would get the gold; but you would have sold your property at a higher price in silver, and when converted into gold you would have received more gold for your property than you do now. (Applause.) With gold at 100 per cent premium over silver now, if on free coinage it went to 25 per cent premium, 75 per cent premium would have been taken out of it. If the demand for wheat in the United States were suddenly to be transferred to corn, wheat in the markets of the world would decline, and corn would advance. Thereafter you could exchange a certain quantity of corn for more wheat than you could before. Money is a function given by law, and a bimetallic law would transfer the demand from gold to silver. Silver would spring into existence as full primary money. Our silver would cease to go abroad, and would be coined into money here. This would lower the supply of silver in the London market, and it would immediately advance in price there. (Applause.)

I want right here to answer Mr. Horr's proposition, that we cannot by law confer value upon silver or anything else. I have already answered that, if you will notice, but I want to answer it further. It is not the stamp upon the coin that gives value to it, it is the law creating it as money. (Applause.) It is the law

that gives to silver the new use of money which it has not now. When you make a new use for a thing you increase its value. Wheat would not be worth as much as it is now if it were not for its use when ground into flour for bread. Silver would not be worth so much if it were not for the use we propose for it, to coin it into money for the use of the people as an exchange. (Applause.) It is in the exchange of property that wealth is acquired; and when you can exchange your property for more gold than formerly, you are benefited if you are a gold debtor. To assist in taking the demand from gold is to your interest. It is to the interest of the men to whom you owe the gold to keep the demand on it. It is to your interest to take it off. When you have given full money functions to silver you have taken a demand off gold.

But, we are answered, gold will go out of circulation, and a panic will result. If it should prove true that gold went out of circulation it would be because silver had come into circulation. We would have more primary money in circulation in silver to start with than we have now in gold. A panic could not come for that reason. If on the second Tuesday in November, 1896, a bimetallic President and Congress are elected, you have passed the breakers in a day. The next morning when the news is known silver will begin to advance and gold to decline. (Applause.) Before Congress meets and the law is passed the influence of the United States will have exerted itself in the markets of the world on both gold and silver. During this interim gold will be the measure of values, but silver will be advancing to it, and the nearer silver gets to gold the less fears creditors will have.

Passing from a specie basis to paper in 1861, did not

bring on a panic. It brought good times. Passing from a paper basis to specie in 1879 created no disturbance. In fact, paper and gold had come together before the day of resumption had arrived. It worked then as it will work now. Gold and silver will come together before the act is passed. (Applause.)

PEOPLE WHO DO NOT WANT FREE COINAGE.

Mr. Horr: I was just talking of the great army of people of the United States who are classified under the head of trades and transportation. We have of them 3,325,962; at least three million of that army get their pay in wages given them each day, week, and month, for the work they have done. You ask them whether they want a dollar that will buy a good many of the things they need, or one that will only buy a part as much as they now receive, and what will be their answer? Why, my friend Harvey seemed to think that if he could get me schooled on that question of silver coinage, and get me on to the stump on that subject, that I would rattle things up wonderfully by carrying around a chart showing the size of the gold in the world. He is mistaken. The size has nothing to do with the value. You may be able to do it, Harvey, but I couldn't refer to a principle and a picture of that kind without stultifying myself. A man who had as much brains as a chipmunk would know better, would know I was trying to mislead him, because size is not the measure of commercial value. You can put a diamond worth a million dollars, the Regent, all inside of a quail's egg, therefore it isn't—

Mr. Harvey: But we would not consider the proposition to make money out of it for the world.

Mr. Horr: We don't make money out of it, no; but

I wouldn't consider the proposition reasonable to go about claiming that it had anything to do with the value of a mètal or that you could base any calculation in reference to value. It is so ridiculous. But I must proceed.

The next witnesses I want to call up are those in domestic and personal service, the hired girls of the United States, the men who sweep the streets, the men who do the personal duties for people in this great country of ours. There are four million three hundred sixty thousand five hundred and six. They are all of them paid wages. They all of them depend upon what they receive each day to find out how well they are going to live the next day. Is there an idiot anywhere on the face of the earth who thinks those men and women would be benefited by giving them less for their day's work of the things they need? for that is what he proposes to do. Take a vote and see where you will come out among that class of wage-earners. Ask them, "Do you want the dollar cheaper than it is now? Do you want to go down town to get a supply for your family and receive only about half what you get now?" Do you think they would be long in voting on the question? That is what he proposes to do. That is four million three hundred sixty thousand five hundred and six that will be added to the persons that that kind of legislation will bring ruin upon. That is the reason why I protest against it. Now I come to the list of those in manufacturing and mechanical industries. All factory hands, all skilled laborers in the United States. Have you any idea how many there are? Five million, ninety-one thousand six sixty-nine. Go round among them, ask them, "Do you want the measure of value reduced? Do you want every dollar you earn cut in two?

Do you want people to tell you that you are getting wages so and so, and then give you half that, instead of the wages you have earned?" Do you think they would be long in deciding this question? You want to take from them what they can earn with their labor. They will all of them protest against it.

The next is agricultural, fisheries, mining. There are nine million thirteen thousand two hundred and one. A part of all those, who are in debt more than they have property with which to pay, would tell you they would like to scale down their debts and pay but fifty cents on the dollar. Ah, but wait a moment. Of these, three million four thousand and fifteen are farm hands, men who work by the day, men who get their pay in cash, not in productions. How will they vote? There is not any question about this. Do you think you are going to fool the people of this great republic by trying to make them think they will be better off not to get over half as much as they now get for every day's work they do? That is the proposition he proposes for the purpose of blessing them. This makes a grand total of people who live by labor, by human effort, in the United States—because this does not include a few people who live on legacies and incomes provided by other people for them—a grand total of twenty-two million seven hundred thirty-five thousand six sixty-one people. Of those people, sixteen million of them receive their pay in wages from day to day and week to week, and large numbers of the others are dependent upon good money in order to be prosperous in this world.

Now, in addition to this army of working people, I have a crowd of witnesses I want to call to the stand to vote on this question. It is a strange-looking crowd that I see coming into the witness-box now. Many of

them are on crutches; empty sleeves are hanging by the sides of many; scars received by the furrowing work of shot and shell when they were risking their lives that this nation might live. Ah, there are women in black in that crowd; there are children clinging to the garments of widowed mothers, made widows by the death of their soldier husbands. One million of them now in the United States! Ask them: "Do you want your pensions cut down by giving you a dollar not worth as much as you have been receiving?" They stood the brunt of battle; they risked their lives that this republic might live, and right now comes the new philosophy which says, "We will cut down their pension rolls by destroying the value of the money we pay them for the glorious work they did." Shame, shame on such patriotism as that.

If you pass this law, you must either double the pay of every pensioner, or you disgrace this great nation of ours. I enter my protest against that effort to disgrace this nation by cheating one million of men whom the government is paying for the risk they took and the hardships they endured that you and I might live in a country worth living in.

Do you think they would vote with you, Harvey? Try it and see.

Again we have in this country—I know Brother Harvey thinks they are wicked institutions, at least I suppose he does—savings banks. The word bank seems to have holy terrors for him. I am not affected that way at all, and especially about a savings bank where the people put from week to week their little savings. Do you know how many of the people of the United States have patronized those wicked institutions, the savings banks? Four million seven hundred and eighty-one

thousand six hundred and ninety-five people. Do you propose to say to them, "Yes, you have worked hard, you have received your pay in gold dollars. Those dollars you deposited when they were worth their face in gold. We propose to let those banks pay you off in dollars that are worth only fifty cents, and do not intend to let you help yourselves, either."

How will they vote, Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr refers to the wages of servant girls. I want to stop a moment to talk on that because it touches a phase of our national character. The wages of servant girls have risen since 1873, at least have been stable. The reason for it is this. The want of money, the difficulty of families to make a living by the methods intended by nature for them to make money, namely, through the male members of the family, have not provided them with means since 1873, and, gradually, our female population has been compelled to seek situations, until they are crowding out the men, and the females of the country are occupying situations that men ought to occupy, and the females ought to be beautifying and making pleasant the homes. This has drawn on the supply of women; with the supply lessened, the wages of servant girls have remained steady or advanced, because it is more difficult now to get servant girls than it was before, the supply of women seeking such situations being short.

It means this, the proposition he has touched on, that we are forcing into the stores of this and other cities young women who must work for ten hours a day, scrambling for life, whose anxieties and heartburnings are a despair to them and are crushing out the hopes of womanhood and the aspirations of these women who should be making such mothers as our mothers were.

(Long continued applause.) That is the only relevancy that his servant-girl proposition has in this debate.

He refers to farm hands. I read a few weeks ago in a newspaper of a farmers' convention in Mississippi, where they had reduced the wages of farm hands to $6 a month. I know in 1873 it was $13 a month. That is the way, Mr. Horr, you have been cutting in two the dollar for the people.

Now I want you to connect what I was saying when I sat down the last time with what I am about to say.

GOLD WILL DECLINE—PROPERTY ADVANCE.

Wheat or corn in existence has its price affected by the new crop coming on before it is harvested. And thus gold will be affected when it is known that a crop of silver is coming that is to compete with it in the markets as money.

When a man tells you that security holders will throw their bonds on the market and break down the price in a scramble for gold, answer that security holders are not such fools.

Men are supposed to act naturally under all circumstances. As gold depreciates, as we have seen it will, prices advance. Gold's decline means advancing prices, and men do not rush to sell securities on an advancing market. When prices are advancing, people buy. When a man tells you that when he knows that free coinage is to come, he is going to invest his money in gold, tell him to invest it in silver, tell him to invest it in corn, wheat, cotton, or anything except gold. (Applause.) Gold is the only thing that will decline, and everything else will follow silver. Turn back to page 343 at the price table and see how they all followed silver down. They will all follow silver up.

But they will say, "Gold will go out of circulation." Suppose it does. When you want it you buy it. When you want gold now you buy it, buy it with your property, exchange your property for it. You would but do the same then. (Applause.)

Again they say, "With silver only in circulation we are on a silver basis." They are wrong. When under the law of a land either metal has a right to enter the mints and be coined into money, that nation is a bimetallic nation. The fact that the people have a right to use the cheaper metal is their salvation, and secures to them a stable currency that will register an exchange value between property over a long period that is equitable. The metal that is not in circulation re-enforces the one that is. It enters into and becomes a part of the other in exerting itself as a measure of values. Both combined are measuring values. It is when the dearer metal only is used as money and the other is demonetized that one only becomes the measure of values.

I have thus far sought to show you that the debtor need have no fear as to his getting gold with which to pay his debt, and that he would get his gold easier with another metal in competition with gold than he can get it now.

I now pass to the question of 16 to 1. We maintain that there will be a commercial parity between gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, if the law is passed putting both metals on an equal footing at that ratio. What we mean by an equal footing is that both shall have the right to enter the mints free to be coined into money with 23.22 grains of pure gold to be a dollar and 371¼ grains of pure silver to be a dollar. The money made from both metals to be full legal-tender money in the payment of all debts, and the debtor to have the right to pay in either metal.

No notes, bonds or other form of indebtedness to be made payable in either metal to the exclusion of the other. All indebtedness to be payable in lawful money, and either gold or silver to discharge such indebtedness.

The two metals will then be in competition with each other to supply the demand for money. The supply is limited and the demand is substantially unlimited. What we mean by the demand being unlimited is this:

When a man owns either metal, and it is a surplus over and above what is needed in the arts, he converts it into money at the mints and puts it himself into circulation. That the business interests of the country demand and will absorb all the gold and silver that can possibly seek the mints for coinage. That if all the gold and silver in the world (a thing impossible) were in the United States, we would be the more prosperous by having it. (Applause.) That if all the silver in the world available for money—$3,931,100,000—were in the United States performing the functions of primary money, it would be our gain and a loss to the balance of the world. When money is dear, money is hoarded. When money is more plentiful, it goes more readily into circulation and seeks investment. When laws encourage the hoarding of money, they are laws injurious to society. Money can be hoarded and at the same time there can be a great demand for money. That is the case to-day. When money appreciates faster by lying in bank vaults than by investing it, it will not seek investment, except on stock or bond investments for a sudden rise in the market and for similarly quick transactions. It will not seek legitimate investment.

That is the case now.

To say that there is plenty of money at a time like

this, when there are no profits in general business and tens of thousands are seeking work and cannot get it, all wanting money and cannot get it, and manufactories working half time, is to admit there is something wrong. I call the attention of the reader to the fact that Mr. Horr, advocating the gold standard in this debate, offers no remedy. He is satisfied with the present conditions. His whole argument is that no remedy is needed. He says there is enough money, but admits that business will not absorb it, but does not tell us why it does not absorb it. We thus see, if I am right, that a plentiful supply of money would of itself cause money to seek investment and flow readily into circulation. This would make business. It is not life that makes blood; it is blood that makes life. It is money in circulation that makes business.

An increased volume of good money—and gold or silver either has always been good money—has always advanced civilization, and there has never been too much of it. So, I am justified in saying there is an unlimited demand for money.

I can state another fact that you will recognize as a truth: as the volume of primary money increases, business increases, and the demand for more money is created.

I am justified in standing on the position that the demand for money is comparatively unlimited.

Mr. Horr: Before commencing where I left off I want to call the attention of the country to the fact that Brother Harvey is again at his old tricks. Since this debate began he has only run onto one thing that was anywhere near right in the world, and that was an Englishman in London.

WOMEN PAST AND PRESENT.

In his last remarks he had to defame the women of the present day.

MR. HARVEY: I did not, sir.

MR. HORR: He said in so many words that what the girls of the present day needed was to be relieved from the present work of the world, that they were crowding themselves into, because they had to in order to become such women as our mothers were.

MR. HARVEY: Yes, that is right.

MR. HORR: I knew I was right. (Laughter.) Yes, there is something wrong with the girls of to-day.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr, don't you dare say that I have passed any implication upon the womanhood of this country. (Long continued applause.)

MR. HORR: Why, not a bit of it.

MR. HARVEY: I said that civilization should be such that they would not be required to burn out their lives upon the selfish pyre your gold standard has constructed. (Applause.)

MR. HORR: Now listen. He could not help taking the view of it that he did. My view is an entirely different one. We can't agree on anything, Harvey. I think that the fact that the girls of America have independence of character enough to start out and take hold of new enterprises, learn new businesses, and go to work and get bank accounts of their own, is to their credit, and not to their shame. (Applause.) The bank account of a young woman representing money that she has earned herself does her as much good morally as poor preaching. (Laughter.) It develops her character. Another thing, there isn't any truth in the idea that the girls of to-day are not just as good as our mothers

were when they were girls, and I repel as totally false the whole idea that we are always talking about, what wonderfully marvelous beings our mothers were, and what good-for-nothing silly things the girls now-a-days are.

MR. HARVEY: Nor did I say that.

MR. HORR: I want to say this for the benefit of the girls of to-day. Don't get discouraged over that kind of talk. When you get to be old women, Harvey's crowd will still be telling what wonderful creatures you were when you were young, and they will be abusing the girls of that day. (Laughter and applause.) But I must go on with the question.

SAVINGS BANKS AND LIFE INSURANCE.

I have just stated that the people who have deposits in the savings banks are over four million; the deposits in those institutions are $1,712,760,026—every dollar of it put in from the hard toil of the American people, and in dollars worth one hundred cents all over the world.

He proposes to cut that amount in two, to send those depositors off with half their money.

Building and loan associations have 1,745,725 depositors, representing $526,852,885. Pay them off in cheap money, although they all have put in gold dollars!

Loan and trust companies; there are about three million depositors in them.

Life-insurance companies. The people of the United States are struggling, many of them, to provide against death, to leave a little something for their wives and their children. Do you know how many of them have

done it? 4,537,286. The liability of those companies is $3,691,686,594. Cut that in two, not pay that money at its face? Bless them, will it, to let them pay the widows and the orphans off in cheap money?

Why, I protest against the whole system, because it is wholesale repudiation. It is wholesale disregard of moral obligations in the business world.

But to these must be added other persons who have deposited in the state and private banks and have deposited gold dollars. You would pay them off with cheaper ones. You haven't any right to do it; it is an outrage upon the people of this nation. Ah, but wait. Every man and woman in the United States who has some money in his or her pocket, who carries a little about for a rainy day, unless it is in gold you would cut the value of their money one-half and compel them to use cheap money where they did have good money.

And you tell me then that this law is in the interest of the many, do you? Why, it is in the interest of the few. Such class legislation was never before attempted in this country of ours.

Who is to be benefited? The silver miners and those who own the mines, about 30,000 in the United States, and such farmers and other producers as are hopelessly in debt. And I shall show you, that even the latter iass will be injured and not blest.

SILVER AND HEN PRODUCT COMPARED.

The silver product, whose friends are making such a noise, is not very large. All the silver we produce in the United States, that they are so agonizing over, is worth just about half as much as the eggs laid each year by the hens in the United States. (Laughter.) Give

the hens of this nation a fair chance, and they will cackle you out of this debate. (Laughter and applause.) The value of the silver crop is just about equal to the retail value of the peanuts sold in the United States every year, and in order to benefit that small product you propose to change the monetary system of this great nation and send our people onto a silver basis and do the business of this country on debased money.

I now come to the most destructive effect of this free silver legislation.

It would be the destruction of all credit. I will risk my reputation as a man of observation as to the result; I hope it will never be tried, but if it is tried, mark my words, you will bring upon this country such a business panic as this nation never saw, and I will show you why. The paralysis of business will be complete, because credit is the basis of commercial transactions at the present day. We do more business—ay, ninety-eight per cent of all the business done to-day in the United States is done on credit, the confidence that men have in each other, the ability to do as they agree, the sacred keeping of obligations.

You strike down that principle and you strike down the faith of the world in our people as a nation, and when that is done such ruin will come to us as beggars description. (Applause.)

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Horr refers to life insurance. There have been thousands of men in this country wrecked financially in the last twenty-two years by reason of their inability to keep up their payment of premiums (applause), and the insurance companies, who are substantially money-lenders, have taken what those men had paid as forfeits. The gold standard through the

insurance company business has inflicted a severe wound upon this country.

Mr. Horr refers to repudiation, says this is repudiation that we propose. There is only one thing that in my mind is more criminal than the Act of 1873, and that is for a man who tries to sustain that crime to say that the men who intend to right it mean repudiation. (Applause.)

I am much obliged to Mr. Horr for calling your attention to the small value of the total quantity of silver in theUnited States. We claim the quantity is small in the world and that the demand will take it all up. (Applause.) I did think, however, that he showed his weakness when he relied on a "cackle" for argument.

Now connect what I was saying with what I am about to say.

THE EFFECT OF REMONETIZATION.

The supply of silver is limited. When a great nation like the United States, whose normal capacity for the absorption of money in the transaction of its normal business is not far from four thousand million dollars, opens its mints to silver, it fixes the price of silver the world over. An apt illustration would be this:

Suppose ten million pounds of beef were all the beef available for the next year. So long as that supply was thus limited, if Phil Armour were to fix a price of twenty cents a pound that he would pay for it, no one else could buy it for any less (less freight to Chicago).

So long as the supply of silver is limited, as it is now, no one will part with it for any less than he can get for it in the United States.

Mr. Horr will say to this as he said the other day,

"The government does not buy the silver under free coinage. It stamps it and hands it back to the owner worth no more than when he brought it to the mint."

What the government has done is this: It has given to silver a new use, and the new use is what gives to it its value. It is not the stamping of the coin, but the new use, the function of money that has been conferred on the metal, as it now gives it to gold. Why does a great nation like the United States fix the price of silver at a ratio to gold when a nation like Mexico cannot do it? It is this.

All the nations of the world are dealing with the United States, most of them largely. When they can bring their silver here and exchange it for our products and wares that they need, get a fair exchange, they are not going to part with their silver anywhere else for less in exchange for it than they can get here. We can take all the silver they have in any one year, and then go to work and raise and make the same things over again and ask them to come again. That is what we mean by the United States fixing the price of silver. France did it for seventy years at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and it was on that ratio that exchanges were computed on silver and gold in the London market. The United States is larger and more influential than France was or is, and is better situated to dominate the commerce of the world. (Applause.)

Let me make that matter plain if I have not made it so; that with the quantity of silver in the world limited —I have shown you the fact, and the use that is being made of it, the fact that there is virtually no surplus, then when we throw open our mints and thus make a great money market where any one can go and

coin his silver into money, and buy our products with his silver, we have here in the United States erected a market for that commodity that will absorb all the silver in the world if necessary, by giving us the silver in exchange for the products of our fields and our looms. We get their silver and they get our products. We have more primary money, and they get what we have parted with.

The history of nations is that the more primary money you have, the more prosperous your nation is.

Now do you believe that they are going to give us all their silver? What will they do for money if they do? Will the little gold that is left go around to all the balance of them? We must reason as reasonable men; that when the great United States, which can make an unlimited demand for silver, opens her mints, and stands ready to exchange the products of the world for that silver, the owners of that silver are not going to part with it for any less to any other people than they can get for it from the people of the United States. (Applause.)

You make an unlimited market for a limited product, and with a great country like the United States you establish permanently its legal ratio with gold, or in other words the price of silver as compared with gold. (Applause.)

We have been deceived about this matter just as we have been deceived about the unit in our coinage system, the amount of silver coined before 1873 and many other things.

Free coinage and the use of silver as money would give us the trade of all the silver using countries. People trade with those nations most where what they have

will the most readily be taken in exchange. This has always been true of the weaker nations. Our relation to Europe is different. The European nations, especially England, are consumers. They are forced to buy for consumption. If we had the principal trade of India, China, Japan and South America, which we would have, with silver exchange acceptable in payment of balances, the world's market would be transferred from London to New York. (Applause.) San Francisco and all our ports would feel the stimulus of trade. Our trade with Europe would be stimulated in this way. Our virtual monopoly of the trade of those countries that now supply Europe with many articles would put these articles under the control of our traders, and we would fix the price to Europe on these articles, whereas Europe now fixes the price for us. (Applause.)

ENGLAND AS A FINANCIAL OCTOPUS.

It will take time to break the hold that England has on the world with her gold-standard debts. But in this we shall have the sympathy of all the nations that are now paying her tribute from poor little Nicaragua to republican France. We should immediately exert our influence to save Japan and other nations from going over to the gold standard, and stop the conquest of the world that is being made by the money power of England.

She is heartless and cruel in the extreme. She enforces the debts due her citizens from the citizens of other nations by laying tribute, imposing "smart money" and taking possession of custom houses. She has taken possession of Egypt in the interest of her creditor citizens, and imposes and collects taxes upon those people

who are her bonded slaves. She is the bully of the seas, and the financial octopus of the world. Her tentacles reach into every nation in the world, including our own, sucking from them their life blood. We bow our heads in humiliation and admit that her great banking house is now behind this government; that we are at its mercy to sustain the credit of this nation, and have paid in the last six months five million dollars tribute to get money which we could create by our own sovereign act. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: Brother Harvey, as usual, does not seem able to quote a matter that I have been speaking about just a moment before, and quote it correctly. I did not compare the amount of eggs produced each year with the amount of silver in the country. He immediately commenced to claim that I said that there was a small amount of silver in the United States. I did not claim anything of the kind. I said that the annual product was small, but there is a difference between the staying qualities of eggs and silver. (Laughter.) Eggs play out when silver don't, you know.

Now I propose to show the country that this talk of Brother Harvey's about there not being any gold in the country—that is, enough to do the business of the country with—is a myth. But before I do it I will say that the silver will rush in from the old world the moment you pass your law. I don't care anything about that, but what I do say about it is this, Mr. Harvey, you will drive all the gold out of this country and leave us with nothing but silver with which to do our business. Gold will be taken out the moment you make a dollar and put it in use that is cheaper than the gold dollars, and it will be taken out by people who live right here

in this country, who will send it out. You know the history of it. It is the people that live in a country, when one metal is worth more uncoined than coined, that send the good money out. Of course when we get some more silver—we wouldn't need so much more, but that is not it—you compel us to do business on a basis different from that done by the rest of the world.

THE SUPPLY OF GOLD.

Now is there gold enough in the world to do business with? Violent spasms of apprehension are constantly afflicting our silver friends lest the gold shall give out and the world cease to turn on its axis for want of the wherewithal to purchase lubricating materials for its wheels. They would not suffer so much if they would take occasional doses of the information on the subject with which our newspapers, magazines, reviews and scientific journals are running over full. Their low spirits are largely the result of refusing to examine and think. Now this is all wrong.

The rest of the world is feeling very comfortable on the subject. Why shouldn't we? The output of gold is increasing fast enough in this country and elsewhere to keep pace with all reasonable demand for safe and legitimate business.

In the United States since 1887 we have produced the comfortable sum of \$33,000,000 per annum till 1893, when we jumped to \$36,000,000, and in 1894 we outdid that, reaching about \$43,000,000, and there are no signs of diminution in the supply.

MR. HARVEY: Why don't you take the supply of the world?

MR. HORR: I will in a moment, you will get all you want of it.

Now that should not give Brother Harvey the chills. In Australia they produced thirty-two million dollars in 1892, and thirty-five millions in 1893, and it seems to be only a question of effort as to how much they can do, for they have discovered new fields extending along the west coast a distance of 1,000 miles, and inland in places as far as 350 miles, and of unexampled richness. In South Africa new discoveries added to the older mines have again increased the output to a large extent. In Russia, beginning in 1886 with 30,800 kilograms, they have increased their production every year until 1893, when they put out 39,800 kilograms, with greater opportunities for further progress as far in the future as the scientific eye can reach.

In India (where they let up on silver coinage, you know, a while ago) they have just made the gold mining hum. They took out twenty thousand fine ounces in 1886, fifteen thousand in 1887, thirty-two thousand in 1888, seventy-two thousand in 1889, ninety-six thousand in 1890, one hundred and twenty thousand in 1891, one hundred and sixty thousand in 1892, and one hundred and eighty-four thousand in 1893. Then comes the three Guianas. Starting at eighteen hundred kilograms in 1887, they kept right along increasing until they reach sixty-five hundred in 1893. Now take these six gold-producing regions, the United States, Australia, Russia, South Africa, India and the Guianas, for a period of eight years, except 1894, for which we have no full reports, and we find that gold was taken out in round millions as follows, computed in dollars:

1886	$ 83,000,000	1890	$100,000,000
1887	83,000,000	1891	110,000,000
1888	88,000,000	1892	123,000,000
1889	101,000,000	1893	135,000,000

For eight years up to a year ago last January the world's production of gold for those six regions was the enormous sum of $827,011,695. And last year, and all the rest of the world for those years, are not taken into account. Experts calculate that in one single strip of territory they have located upwards of $1,000,000,000 in gold. According to Mulhall, the world's available stock of gold in 1850 was $2,535,000,000, and of silver $4,880,000,000, or of both $7,415,000,000. In 1890 the figures were $6,175,000,000 of gold and $6,065,000,000 of silver, or $12,240,000,000. The increased rate of the production of gold indicates that by 1900 we shall have more gold than in 1850 we had of both metals, in addition to the six hundred twenty million of limited subsidiary coins, which are a legal tender in small sums, and three thousand four hundred million of legal-tender silver that is still current in the world. But it will then only be used for what it is worth. Now when Mr. Harvey sets up his dreadful wail about sorrow, suffering, prostitution, crime, and all that for want of money because of the gold standard, he is simply long on his rhetoric and short on his facts (laughter, and applause); for at the present rate of gold production, which gives evidence of further rapid increase within thirty years, we might double the world's present stock of hard money without putting out another silver dollar. We are rehandling the old sands and stock piles. We are utilizing the water power from mountain streams at the bases thereof and sending it back up the mountain in the form of electricity to do our work in mining. In Portland, Oregon, for many years water power has generated the electricity, which has been carried a distance of fifteen miles, to light and supply the manufacturing

interests and run the railroads of a flourishing city at a very low cost. Similar things have more recently been accomplished elsewhere in this country, and we can put electricity into use on mountain tops, in the bowels of the earth, and almost anywhere with comparatively slight expense. New processes and new mechanisms are being supplied by inventive genius to furnish us a substantial gold cure for Brother Harvey's silver jim-jams. More than that, the cost of mining all metals has greatly decreased. For instance, the Quincy copper mine in Michigan shows that in 1864 it cost 26.71 cents per pound to produce copper, while in 1894 it only cost 5.68 cents, about one-fifth, although the ore was no richer, and was mined at far greater depth, while wages had been advanced from $38.76 per month in 1879 to $50.70 in 1894. See the *Iron Age*, April 18, 1895, page 824.

MORE MONEY NEEDED.

MR. HARVEY: All that Mr. Horr has said about no more money being needed on account of electricity and other facilities should be taken by you in this way. The more rapidly the blood flows through your body the more blood you need. The more civilization advances and the more business is classified, the greater the volume of money that is necessary to make the exchanges of products and services. (Applause.) Where a man living forty years ago could afford to leave home for a journey of thirty days with fifty or one hundred dollars, he would now want to take several times that amount with him. Then he ate with his hospitable neighbor, traveled by buggy or wagon. Now by the rapid interchange of commercial blood travel and business require infinitely more money. One of the serious mis-

takes that we make is that improved facilities and the advance of civilization makes less money necessary; it is just the opposite, more money is necessary. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr is unfair when he takes the production of gold for a few years. I have given you the right way to look at it by giving you the table that I gave in this day's debate covering a long period of years. He refers to reports from Africa and elsewhere of the great production of gold promised. To any man who has ever been in a mining camp where reports go out, or to any man who has ever been deceived by those reports, I have only to refer him to his memory. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr reads millions of dollars in large numbers to you, as men of his class like to do, to impress you with the enormous volume of money. I hold in my hand a gold dollar melted down. It is the size of a drop of water. All the gold in the world will go into twenty-two feet, and I want to remind Mr. Horr of that again. For that globule of gold a farmer works and toils to raise two bushels of wheat and gives it up for that dollar of gold that is infinitely of less value to the world than the two bushels of wheat.

PRACTICAL EFFECTS OF FREE SILVER.

I want to talk for a few minutes on what effect silver as a currency has had since 1873 on those nations which have had more of it on account of our using less of it. The stoppage of free coinage of silver by substantially all the European governments and by the United States immediately gave an impetus to the trade of India with the silver-using nations of the world, and her exports were also largely increased to gold-standard countries. In 1873 she was almost unknown as a commercial coun-

try, and her people were regarded as indolent and shiftless. However, her soil was rich and her natural advantages great, and under the vitalizing effect of increased silver currency, that has poured into her since 1873, her people became more industrious and a complete change took place. In 1873 she produced only 978,000 bales of cotton, while in 1890 she had increased her crop to 2,238,000. In 1873 her exports of wheat were only nominal, while in 1892 they were to England alone 59,000,000 bushels. In the statistics compiled by Archbishop Walsh of Ireland it is shown that prior to 1873 the exports of yarn from India were practically nothing. In her exports of this one item of yarn to China and Japan alone the following table shows a marvelous increase:

	Pounds.		Pounds.
1874	1,000,000	1885	75,000,000
1875	5,000,000	1889	127,000,000
1880	25,000,000	1891	165,000,000

In 1891 she imported from China 2,420,295 tens of rupees of merchandise, while during the same year she exported merchandise to China of the value of 14,295,934 tens of rupees. Nor did her vastly increasing commerce stop with silver-using nations. In her commercial relations with the gold-standard countries, beginning with and after 1873, the balance of trade was in favor of India.

I hold in my hand a newspaper press telegram from the City of Mexico. It is dated July 16, 1895, and reads as follows:

"Many print-cloth mills are running night and day, and even now are unable to supply orders. Native mills are finding an increase in business as a result of the depreciation in silver, which renders importation of ordinary classes of print cloths excessively costly. High

exchange on the United States and Europe protects native mills." (Applause.)

Japan is now coming into existence as a wonderfully commercial côuntry. It has been under her increased supply of silver. Papers of this city have been having special articles from Japan in the last week or two which are a lesson upon this financial question. It is their use of silver and our limited disuse of it that has given to Mexico, India, and Japan the stimulus in civilization that they have received recently, and if it were to continue with their monopolizing of silver even against the deterioration of the climate in which they exist they would advance to a period of civilization under that influx of money that they never possibly could reach without it. (Applause.) Any panics in those countries from now on if they have a monopoly of silver will be on account of the bank credit system which may relax and contract to choke prosperity.

INDEPENDENT ACTION.

I am in favor of independent action of this country because it rights a great wrong. If it be said that some one will be injured, the answer is that more have been injured by the wrong. And again that more will be injured by the continuation of the crime. Again the answer is, to continue it is to sacrifice the life and happiness of millions, and to invite the destruction of our national existence. Where there is a necessity there is a remedy. Another reason for independent action is that we should be free from all European influences. When our forefathers declared their independence they intended that this government be free from all class legislation of Europe. To admit that international action in this matter is necessary is to admit

that the parliaments of the monarchies of Europe can make laws for us affecting this nation in its most vital interests. (Applause.) We would repel by a declaration of war an attempt to lay a tax upon us to support their governments, and yet with the assistance of tories in our midst we allow them, by financial law, to deplete us of hundreds of millions of dollars. And now this tribute-laying has so injured and crippled us as to make us seemingly unconscious of the humiliation of our national finances being in the hands of a London banking house.

And what reason do they give you for all this? They say that we must have an international money, as if trade with them were worth the price of our liberties. When you are dealing with nations whose commerce bears the relation that ours does to theirs, we can exert a more powerful influence in fixing their financial policy than they can in fixing ours. They need our trade more than we need theirs. We had no international money between 1861 and 1879. We did not need it then, and we do not need it now. International balances with Europe are now settled by weight and not by the stamp upon the coins. Balances are settled in bullion by weight, and passing as merchandise and not as money. There is no such thing as international money.

Mr. Horr: I was cut off as I was closing upon the question of the production of gold. Now it might have irritated my friend and his followers, and if he desires to know all the facts of this branch of the subject he can consult an article in the January, 1895, *North American Review*, written by Hon. Robert E. Preston, the director of the United States mint; and another by J. E. Frankel, in *The Forum*, of February, 1894, and pages

122 to 134, inclusive, of a work callea "Bimetallism" and written by Henry Dunning McLeod, an eminent authority, all of which works I now hand, as an eye-opener, to Mr. Harvey, so that he may again size up that cube of gold which he illustrates in his "Financial School," and has been talking about here so much to-day, as having only twenty-two feet on each side. Upon further enlightenment he may conclude to extend its dimensions somewhat. (Applause.)

PROSPERITY OF THE PEOPLE.

Now I desire to say that there is no such general lack of prosperity even here in the United States as we have heard about continually from the first to the end of this debate. I judge of the prosperity of the people by mingling among them. I speak somewhat from experience. Since the "demonetization," as they call it, of silver, I have visited thirty-one of the states of this Union. During that time I have traveled over 500,000 miles in the United States alone; I have mingled with her people; I have seen them on farm and in factory. There is nowhere living to-day in any country on the face of the earth a people who enjoy as many of the comforts and necessities of life as the people of the United States of America have enjoyed since 1873. In 1891 I was in a little town in Iowa, right in the midst of farms. They held a fair in a small place, and we counted 238 covered buggies and spring wagons at that little farmers' fair. Go where you will, you see evidences of thrift and evidences of no such starvation as my friend Harvey would claim. Look at the bicycles we have bought this last year. (Applause.) I looked up the industry. This people that are on the verge of

destruction bought within the last twelve months a little over 500,000 bicycles; paid $30,000,000 for them, all on the eve of starvation, eh? And that isn't an article of necessity. It is used more or less in business, but it is used largely for recreation and for giving the people an artistic view of the human shape divine, you know. (Laughter and applause.)

And now I wish to say that bimetallism is not, as my friend Harvey claims, entirely the way that nature works. In the opening of this discussion he tells us that nature generally produces things on the bimetallic plan. You are familiar with it. It was new to me, you know. He says that we have two hands and two feet and two eyes, and that nature works by twos. He hasn't examined the case carefully, philosophically nor scientifically. It is true we have two eyes, but only one head; we have two hands, but only one mouth. Good gracious! What would become of this country if our Populist friends had two mouths! (Laughter and applause.) We have two feet, but it doesn't follow on that account that we ought to have two wives—no. Because I myself happen to be a twin, and because nature did splendidly, in that effort (laughter and applause), it don't follow that people who are born one at a time are to be counted as unnatural. (Applause.) The whole theory is too big a humbug to talk about.

Now I want to tell you what is a fact: We have in this world but one measure of distance, length. That is all we ought to have, all we can have safely, it is fixed by a law of nature; and if every yardstick and every line of every surveyor of the world were lost we could produce another that would not vary a hair's breadth from the one that was lost. Just the same with a weight;

we use one measure of weight, one measure of capacity; if we should forget how much measured capacity there is in a bushel in a quart, a law of nature would be called to our aid and scientific knowledge and we would produce the other.

STABLE MEASURE OF VALUE.

We should also have one measure of values. It can not be made as accurate as these other measures, but we must take the metal for our measure that is most stationary, that the world is best satisfied with. And then let me give you this proposition: If it is slowly increasing in value it blesses more people than it harms. It is sudden changes that bring ruin upon the commerce of a nation. Slight ones are never injurious, but you propose by one stroke to cut the measure in two. It is agreed without any exception by men who have studied this question that you cannot keep gold in circulation in this country beside silver when the ratio between the two is so different—you cannot do it with one-quarter of one cent in favor of gold—what can you do with fifty cents in the dollar? Now I beg of the people of this country to stop and reflect what they are doing. It is a part and parcel of the old notion that what we need is cheap money; that the government has the power to make money of anything. Brother Harvey, if you can double the prosperity of the world and double the value of all property in the world by restoring the old ratio of 16 to 1, why don't you go back to the old days of Nebuchadnezzar, or away back of that time, take Rameses II., when the ratio was 4 to 1, and establish that? If by law you can double property in that way, why not bless the world by making them worth ten times what they are—why do you want to benefit them

just one half? Why not carry out your power? Why, every man of sense knows that you cannot fix values in that way. Why doesn't somebody spring up. why do not the copper miners ask that their metal shall be made money of final redemption? Ah, Mr. Harvey, we don't destroy the use of silver as money—that whole argument of yours is specious. We are using to-day one billion three hundred million more of silver than we did before 1873, and using it as money; have taken it out of the markets of the world for other purposes and placed it in use as money. Taken it for what it is worth. That is all any money of final redemption ever should be placed in any market at. The money of final redemption, if it is honest, must be worth just as much coined as uncoined. It must be worth in the markets of the world just as much in the form of bars or dust, there is no difference what shape, if the metal is pure, they will simply weigh it and reduce it to the measure, which is one grain of gold to-day in the world, and use it as they do any other commodity. I don't have to use money if I send a cargo of wheat to London, in order to pay for another cargo of something over there. My wheat pays the bills. Formerly in old times they had to send the money, took it in the vessel, everybody had to carry with them on long voyages. All that is ended now. Now our beautiful banking system, which is blessing the nations of the world, enables us to do the business on a small amount of primary money, and base our transactions on credit and on the other property of the world. (Applause.)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr prefers to be humorous. This is a serious matter with the people of the United States. We regard it, on our side of this question, in a serious

way. If they can divert the minds of the people by treating the question as they treat it, if it is a fact that property is accumulating in the hands of the few, and the many are becoming poorer and poorer, and we are traveling in the same route that all republics are traveling, to monarchy and despotism, then his argument is a good argument to make on the other side of the question, to keep us going in that direction. I will only answer one thing in his last speech: He says that it is unfair to have two measures in money, that it should be the same as in the measure of length and weight, and makes illustrations for comparisons. Now money is not the same, cannot be considered in the same way that you can consider weight and measure. In money we rely for bimetallism upon two materials, two substances. There is more stability in that than relying upon one metal. For bread food we rely upon wheat, corn, and rice. For meat we rely upon beef, pork, and mutton, and beef cannot rise inordinately high as long as pork and mutton are in competition with it. You must have in a financial system a balance—like the two metals of which the pendulum of a clock is made, made of two metals to counteract each other—so in your financial system it is safer to have two metals to rely on than one. And when you have them under control of the law, and put them each in competition with the other, then the one cannot advance without the other taking its place, and if the nation is large enough to dominate the commerce of the world they will stay at a parity as they did for all the hundreds of years that we have a record of prior to 1873. (Applause.) You put yourself on a false money measurement when you use one metal which the money-

lenders can corner at their pleasure. Do not be misled on this financial question by any sophistry, but study for yourselves, and you will arrive at the same conclusion that I have. Gold will not go out of this country. If we have free coinage of silver the use of money in the United States will establish a parity between the two, and then gold will be held. A man settling a balance with us in Europe, if he cannot get silver to send, must send us gold. The argument I have made in this debate should convince you that upon the United States adopting the free coinage of silver its extensive use as money will take the metal out of the markets of the world and force a parity as it was forced prior to 1873.

With independent action of the United States other nations will follow her example. We have allowed England to set the example for the world. The United States when she exerts her power is greater than England. (Applause.) And when she exerts it the other nations of the earth will take hope. France will follow. She said at the Conference of Brussels, "We are here to hear your proposition and are ready to accede to it. Name it. What is it?" Mexico and South America will be with us; China and Japan and all the weaker nations of the world; and with France by our side, we will have more strength, more influence upon the metals of the world, than the Latin Union and the United States had in 1873 when they were at a parity. (Applause.) All we have to do is to have the heart to go ahead and do the right. (Applause.) The "way to resume" was to resume, and the way to remonetize is to remonetize. (Applause.) Creditors the world over, when they can control the legislation of the country

can dictate what money shall be named in the bond, and England is doing that. The necessities of the people make them sign the bonds to get the money. To relieve the necessities of to-day they will take chances on the future and sign the bonds. But the day of reckoning is coming, and English warships are in all the harbors of the smaller countries; the Monroe doctrine has been violated in the western hemisphere by reason of the gold standard. What we want to do is to say to the creditor, "You cannot name in your bond gold alone. You must name in your bond lawful money, and when you name gold alone you either forfeit your debt or it is payable in either gold or silver at the option of the debtor."

That is bimetallic law, and when you have it you have put the two metals in competition with each other, and when the United States leads in this matter, all the nations of the earth except England will follow her.

ENGLAND WILL NOT CONSENT.

England will never follow us; you may wait for international bimetallism with England forever, and you will never get it. The men who control the legislation of England are the money-changers of the world, and they know they are getting two portions of property for one portion of money, and they don't intend to yield that advantage. We should act for ourselves, independent of what other nations do. Less than four per cent of our business is with Europe, ninety-six per cent of our business is domestic business. Which shall we legislate in favor of, the ninety-six per cent or the four per cent? Let us legislate for the people. The selfish money-lenders of this country are allies of the banking-houses of London.

The money-lender is not a patriot, the plain people are patriots. The money-lender will not fight for his country, he sends a substitute; the plain people will fight for their country. In times of distress the money-lender seeks to take advantage of his country and bleeds it at every opportunity. He cannot understand this criticism I make upon his character, for the same reason that he cannot understand that it is treason to his country to advocate the gold standard.

Mr. Horr has alluded in this debate to the old soldier. He made him a part of a specious argument, and he appeals to the men who fought for their country and those who now depend upon their little savings, he appeals to their selfish motives to try to make that little money buy more and more, while that little is dwindling away, and the very life of the government is palsied, that is paying to these old soldiers the pension through which he appeals to them. (Applause.) It is a base appeal. The distress of this country and its dire need for patriotism is a greater appeal to those soldiers than you can possibly make through the argument of money. (Long continued applause.)

Who was it that saved the life of this nation in its wars? It was those soldiers. Who sent substitutes to the war? The men that you (addressing Mr. Horr) are defending here to-day. (Applause.) What did they do while their substitutes were fighting for them? They undertook to ruin the United States government by bleeding it of all they could get; they manipulated and influenced legislation at Washington to deprive the government of the very sustenance that must support the soldiers in the field.

Who sent a substitute to the war and would not brave

his own person to the bullets of the enemy? Grover Cleveland, the champion gold-standard advocate of the United States to-day. (Cheers and applause.)

MR. HORR: I am not here for the purpose of defending or abusing Grover Cleveland. At a proper time and in the proper place I could give my opinion of him without any hesitancy. (Laughter.) But I am here to say that Mr. Harvey ought to be ashamed of himself. (Applause.) When he assaults men who furnished means to put down that Rebellion, as grand a band of patriots as the commercial men of this nation were, he is doing something that is beneath the dignity of a good American citizen. (Applause.)

Let me tell you, Robert Morris, the banker of our Revolution, did as much to save this nation as any general in the field. (Applause.)

Men can have money and still be patriots. Men can save a few dollars and still be decent. Shame on a man who will adopt a philosophy that compels him on all occasions, without exception, to vilify and abuse the people, and the best people of his own country.

GOLD HAS COME TO STAY.

But this debate is drawing to a close. I desire to state to this audience that silver has had its day as a money of final redemption. It will always be used as money for the purposes for which nature adapted it.

Gold has come to stay because gold is better adapted than silver for the great transactions of American life.

It has come to stay because the people of the whole civilized world like it, believe in it, prefer it. (Applause.)

He talks about England—I have no great respect for England; but England did not dictate this matter. In the monetary conference of 1867 the civilized na-

tions adopted the very principle that was embodied into the law of 1873. I stated that before, and Brother Harvey promised before we quit to show me that I was wrong. If he will try it, he will have a good time. I have the report of that monetary conference right here, and when you dispute that proposition of Mr. Shaw's we will see about it. (Applause.)

But now, Brother Harvey, before we close, I have a very pleasant duty to perform. I never allow any one to outdo me in little matters of courtesy.

You were kind enough to give me a souvenir of the days of Jefferson and Madison, and even a coin struck in the year that the great patriot Washington died.

I now, Brother Harvey, have the pleasure of presenting to you two coins. They are coined by a nation you admire. I present them both to you because you believe in bimetallism (laughter), that things should go in pairs. I know you won't refuse them. One is a silver coin worth twenty cents. I would have had a Chinese tael if it could have been found, but it is a coin that is never struck. The measure of value in China is a certain weight of silver called a tael, but no taels have ever been coined. The little coin is copper. It only takes a thousand of them, Brother Harvey, to make one of our silver dollars when it is not backed by gold in value. Now you can buy two thousand of them with one of our dollars which are based upon gold.

The reason those coins represent China is because they represent the civilization of China. We would have no use for copper coins, ten of which it would take to equal a cent in value. Our transactions are too large for that. You must select a nation where they pay only three or four cents a day for work, then such coins

come in play. They have to split things up so fine in making change that they must have those little value-less coins.

Silver is their standard; gold is no legal-tender in China. Silver is the best they have. Silver is the metal money of nations that have a low order of civilization. China has no railroads of any account; China has no carriages, the people are carried on the shoulders of the lower Chinamen. A man gets two dollars a month on which to support his wife and family there.

Where wages are low, where labor is so poorly paid for, they get along with money of that kind.

Now you want to base the monetary system of this nation upon the experience of a nation that has ceased to grow. China claims to be 20,000 years old—of course I don't know about that. (Laughter.) It is so much older than I am that I cannot tell about it myself.

But the dollar he gave me on Saturday was struck by a nation that had progress in it. It did very well at that time, but now we are not the same country. When I moved, or more properly, when my people moved me, from the hills of Vermont into the woods of Ohio, we were thirteen days in a covered wagon going the distance. Now I cross the continent in five days. The whole nation has been built up, and with it has come this new monetary system with gold for the center.

Listen, Brother Harvey. The sun is the center of our system. The world revolves around the sun and the moon revolves around the world, the lesser always around the greater. So in the use of metals as money you should place the more valuable where civilization demands it and make that the center, silver to revolve around it, and copper around that, but the yellow metal

should always be the center, as is the yellow orb of the universe. (Applause.)

Don't forget it. The people of this country, Mr. Harvey, are going to decide this question. I do not say that they will decide it as I think they ought to, but I will say this, if they decide it as you think they will, I will base my reputation as a prophet and as a man of sense on the result, and if I live—I may not—if I do not I will look down from my seat in the heavens (laughter), and I will see this nation of ours suffering as I have told you to-day.

No people can violate the great laws of the universe and go unhurt.

A single standard, the best metal in the world, should be used as the basis of money and the center of the monetary system. If I am right, time will demonstrate it.

I desire now to thank you for the kind treatment I have received at your hands. The little discomfort that I did receive was not your doing. I have nothing but the kindest feelings for Mr. Harvey in this whole controversy.

Of course it is hard for me to see how a man can believe as he does (laughter), but on that account I do not denounce him. He spoke in his remarks the other day of some unkind words that I had used in conversation about him here in the city. I suppose I know the report he refers to, and I want to say I never uttered a word of the kind published in the newspapers, not a syllable. (Applause.)

I discuss this question from principle. If I know my own heart I want to do what is best for the people of this nation. I believe that bimetallism undertaken on

the plan of Mr. Harvey, by passing a law and placing this nation on a silver basis, on the plan that is to-day in use in Mexico, China and a few of the lower-grade nations of the world, would bring disaster to the business interests and to the working-people of this entire country. (Applause.) It is against that that I am arguing, and if I am wrong I am not to blame. (Applause.)

I have studied the question as thoughtfully and carefully and conscientiously as I ever studied any question in my life, and I say to the people of the United States now, be careful, do not follow off after these vague and whimsical notions. They lead only to destruction. The business of the world, if it is permanent and prosperous, must be done upon the basis of honesty.

Repudiation is not a good thing for the people of any country, and the free coinage of silver is repudiation for the people of this nation. (Applause.)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Horr presents me with a silver Chinese piece. I accept it, believing that it comes with good grace and kindly feeling from Mr. Horr.

I object to what he says in that presentation as reflecting upon that metal.

The United States is the chief producer of silver; tens of thousands of miners are now in our Rocky Mountains who went there by the encouragement of the laws of our country that made silver a money metal. Many of them who are yet living are to-day sitting by their lunch buckets upon the mountain sides, waiting, with anxiety and patriotic hope, this great battle that is waging in the states of the east. Their cheers are for us. The laws of Jefferson and Jackson sent them there. Until 1873 that metal that this coin typifies was the most sacred metal of our monetary sys-

tem. It as a unit regulated the value of all our other coins (applause), and it was an honored metal until it was struck down in its own country, struck down, I have a right to say, by a dagger—struck as Cæsar was struck; and the same men who drove that dagger to the heart of this nation in the destruction of that metal as money now say the same things that the assassins of Cæsar said, "We are honorable men." (Applause.)

We are not patterning after China; neither are we going to adopt the financial system that is the birth, origin and result of a crime. (Applause.)

You have set up a crime and undertake to sustain it as an example to the morals of this country, a national crime, and that metal represented in this coin that he gives me typifies that crime.

He speaks of the solar system and of the planets that revolve around it. Under a gold standard England is the center of the solar commercial system; under that metal as the unit of value in our coinage, with gold and silver both as money, the United States will be the center of the commercial solar system. (Applause.) The market of the world will be transferred from London to New York.

He refers to the metal he likes as the yellow metal, and compares it to the sun. We look upon that metal in the coin he gives me as pure and white, as emblematic of virtue and honesty and purity. We would make it money with the other metal that he has named, and without reference to color or previous condition of servitude. (Applause.)

I thank you, Mr. Horr, for the coin.

A MESSAGE OF HOPE.

I am about to close this debate. I want, in the words

that I shall utter, to extend an encouraging message to the distressed people of the United States; I want to say to them that relief is coming; to pick up courage; and to those who are suffering until their hopes are crushed and who contemplate abandonment of all hope in their business, I say, do not do so. Hope, comfort and relief are coming. Manhood in this country is again going to be revived. We are going to force this country by the sheer influence of intelligence to cease its worship of property and money as of greater value than humanity. (Applause.)

Some Scottish troops were once surrounded by the enemy, and after constant fighting, with provisions cut off, the Scottish soldiers were dying of hunger; they were still brave and could repel the enemy, but the wasting away of life from starvation had brought them to the consideration of the question of surrendering. They had waited in vain for re-enforcements. When about to send forth the flag of truce to announce that fact, after waiting for many days and weeks for re-enforcements to relieve them, the soldier who started with the message had but mounted the parapets when he heard in the distance the Scotch bagpipes of the Scottish soldiers playing "The Campbells Are Coming." There was no surrender, and there was victory.

Let me say to the people of the United States that if you will but listen, you will hear the music upon the air, "The Campbells Are Coming"—the spirits of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln are coming. (Applause.)

The same oppression that is now manifesting itself in this country by a fraudulent money measurement of values that is confiscating your property, has, in one

form or another, existed throughout all the history of the world. It first entrenches itself in power with the officers who obey its commands. As your property falls in value the salaries of these officers are increased. Where 17,000 bushels of wheat would have paid the President's salary of $25,000 in 1873, it will take 80,-000 bushels to pay the salary of Mr. Cleveland of $50,-000 now.

With the encouragement of the money power comes increased salaries and official corruption; hence official despotism.

To-day liberty is appealing to us from all over the world. Cuba is to-day striking for liberty against the oppressor, Spain. I have stood in the harbor of Havana and looked upon that old fortress at its mouth, and had told to me by a citizen of Havana that beneath its walls underground were subterranean channels, passages and cells; that citizens of Cuba, for political crimes only, had been in those cells for years and years, and had never seen daylight.

It is to liberate those people, it is to end their oppression that comes with the money power, the liberty-loving people of Cuba are to-day striking for liberty.

There is a rising in this country, with the money power, a tendency to entrench and protect oppression the world over where it gets the opportunity.

The President of the United States, the willing implement of this money-power tyranny and oppression, has given every assistance to Spain, has sent our war vessels to guard the coasts of Cuba to prevent the friends of Cuba, the Spaniards living in Florida, from going to their succor. He has taken down the flag of this republic when reared upon an island republic in

the Pacific Ocean. He has stricken down the Monroe Doctrine that said, tyranny and oppression should never be further extended upon the western hemisphere.

The poor nations of Central and South America, reduced and debilitated in manhood and property by the gold standard, the bonds that they have had to pay requiring them to give up two portions of their silver and two portions of their property, are to-day the victims of England, and under the policy adopted at Washington she has no one to stop her passage.

We are fighting the battle of liberty for the world. (Applause.) The result of your verdict upon this momentous question will be world-wide. It will convey words of cheer and stimulate the nerves of freemen in every land.

Never was civilization so dependent upon the action of any one people in the world as it is to-day upon the people of the United States.

The money power has crushed human liberty the world over. Civilization arose on the Tigris and the Euphrates. At its birth, this selfish influence through the money power that arrogated to a few the property of the country drove the people seeking liberty away, and they crossed the Mediterranean into Greece and Rome.

In turn this same selfish interest there absorbed the property of the people and sent freemen to modern Europe. Again pursued by the same selfish spirit, those freemen of Europe fled across the Atlantic to America.

There is no other place you can go. The islands of the Pacific Ocean will not sustain the population. We stand to-day with our backs to the Pacific Ocean and our faces to that enemy that has eaten out civilization

in all countries. The tail of that serpent rests in Egypt and India, its body in Europe, and its head is raised in this country. Will you fight it? (Applause.)

Thomas Jefferson when in Paris was asked: "What, in your judgment, is your greatest protection in the United States from tyranny?" His reply was: "In every log cabin in the United States there is a rifle, and tyranny does not dare raise its head." The men who owned those rifles have passed away, but they have left you the ballot, and as you guard and protect that ballot so will you answer to history for the charge that they gave to you. (Applause.) We need a second Declaration of Independence in the United States. (Applause.)

I want to take your minds back to a scene that was enacted upon our soil in Philadelphia when Congress was in session and about to pass that declaration. The old bell-man went into the tower at the hour that Congress convened. There were ten or fifteen thousand people in the streets. He had posted a little boy at the door to give him the signal if the declaration was adopted. Hour after hour went by, and the old man shook his head and said, "They will never do it, they will never do it." Suddenly there was a shout in the streets, and the little blue-eyed boy came into sight, clapping his hands and shouting, "Ring, grandfather, ring." The old man, seizing the tongue of the bell, threw it back and a hundred times he sounded that tocsin that has echoed and re-echoed over this land ever since that memorable day when we declared our first independence from England.

What we need to-day is to have a liberty bell—ten thousand liberty bells to ring out in this country,

speaking the intelligence of this people, that they can understand the war made upon its resources, whether it may be made by a destructive influence or by shot and shell. (Applause.) Teach the people from the little blue-eyed boy—the young and old to live again for their country and to understand that when its liberties are about to be destroyed they should act as their Revolutionary forefathers acted, and declare that we should by right be independent of the financial laws of England or any other land that strikes at our liberty. (Continued applause.)

COMPLIMENTARY RESOLUTIONS.

HON. GEORGE S. BOWEN, of Elgin, Ill.: On behalf of this great audience I desire to offer the following preamble and resolution.

JUDGE VINCENT: Will you read the resolution?

MR. BOWEN: Whereas, the officers and members of the Illinois Club most hospitably opened the doors of their Club to us for the debate just concluded, and at all times and in every particular have displayed toward us a most pleasant and courteous attitude;

Resolved, that upon our own behalf and upon behalf of the great people of the United States who are interested in the important subject here debated, we extend to the Illinois Club our sincere thanks for the hospitable and catholic spirit displayed by them.

And I move that this resolution be adopted by a rising vote.

Resolution was seconded and unanimously adopted.

MR. HARVEY: If the judges please I desire to offer this resolution:

Resolved, that we all owe our thanks, and a cordial appreciation is due, to Miss Harriet A. Shinn, and to her able corps of stenographers, Mrs. R. Howard Kelly, Miss Kate S. Holmes, Miss Julia C. Pomeroy, Mrs.

L. M. Foxcroft, and Miss Lena R. Wilson, for their valuable work, courteous manner, and kind treatment to all parties connected with this debate.

MR. HORR: I second that.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

MR. HORR: I wish to say to the audience that I desire to move a vote of thanks to the gentlemen who have presided and who have so kindly and impartially attended this debate from the beginning to the end. I do it in appreciation of the fact that they have so well performed the duties devolving upon them.

Motion seconded by Mr. Harvey, put, and unanimously carried.

JUDGE MILLER: We thank you for the appreciation of our services, and will say that we have been very much edified and instructed by the very able manner in which this discussion has been conducted. (Applause.)

HON. GEORGE S. BOWEN: On behalf of several gentlemen of this great audience I desire to present a resolution.

JUDGE VINCENT: State the resolution.

MR. BOWEN: That the thanks of this audience be tendered to both of the gentlemen who have taken part in this debate, expressing to them the sincere thanks for the intelligent and able manner in which it has been conducted, and the great amount of information given to the people of the country by this debate.

Which resolution was put and unanimously carried with great enthusiasm.

MR. HORR: I desire to acknowledge the great obligations which I am under to Hon. L. G. Powers, Labor Commissioner of Minnesota, and author of "Farmer Hayseed in Town;" and to Charles H. Sergel, the well known book publisher of Chicago, and joint author of

"Sound Money;" also to Dr. S. A. Robinson of New York, who is patriotically giving all his time, at great sacrifice, to the cause of honest money. He is a member of the Sound Money Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, a non-political organization chartered in 1784 and having no connection with the Stock Exchange or any other exchange. Its membership is limited to one thousand, and its energies are devoted to the study of economic and commercial problems affecting not only New York, but the whole country, and the promotion of the best interests of the people of the United States.

These gentlemen were all of them untiring in their efforts to aid me in the debate, and rendered such valuable service as to put me under lasting obligations to them for their unselfish and gratuitous assistance. I thank each one of them from the bottom of my heart for the help they gave me from the start to the finish.

QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE.

Mr. Horr: I am asked by A. H. Lockwood, of Chicago, to answer this question:

"What effect has an increase or decrease of the quantity or volume of money in circulation upon its value or purchasing power; and what effect upon the prices of commodities and other forms of property?"

The question is open to the query as to what he means by money. People differ in their definition of it. I'll answer and say that the amount or quantity of all kinds of money in circulation as money has some effect on prices. The general tendency is, as the volume increases, prices will increase very slowly. You have to know all the circumstances—sometimes there is more money in the country, and taking it away will not have

any effect at all—there are hundreds of things that enter into it, so I give it as my judgment that it is one of those problems we always state with great precision without knowing very much about.

Mr. Harvey: I have a question by Warren G. Sayre, of Wabash, Ind.:

"If the commercial ratio between silver and gold had been the same in 1792 as it is now, would either Jefferson or Hamilton or Congress have advocated or established the ratio of 15 to 1, or 15½ to 1, or of 16 to 1?"

What that question means is, if the commercial ratio between silver and gold now under demonetization is 32 to 1, say, what would Jefferson and Hamilton have done if it had been 32 to 1 then? It is a question that does not furnish an opportunity for an intelligent reply, because bimetallism had existed as far back as we have any history of it up to 1873, and Jefferson and Hamilton fixed a ratio to agree with the commercial ratio at that time, as well as the legal ratio; the legal ratio was controlling the commercial ratio, and they fixed the commercial to conform with both the legal and commercial ratio of the average Spanish coins.

Mr. Horr: This question is by Dr. T. P. Seeley, Chicago: "Is it not a fact that over $4,000,000,000 of silver in coin is now maintained at a ratio of 16 to 1, or greater, by the different nations of the world, and that not over $40,000,000 of silver bullion needs to be held up by any nation or nations in addition." What does that mean? It is not true that there is over $4,000,000,000 held up to value. It is not true that there is anywhere near that immense quantity of it held up. There isn't a dollar of Mexican, Chinese or Japanese money, there isn't a dollar of any nation

that is on a silver standard, that is held to a value with gold anywhere on the face of the earth. Silver is not held at an equal value with gold except in subsidiary coins, where there is a gold basis, and where they manage to exchange silver dollars into gold whenever it is required, otherwise gold would be at once at a premium and silver at a discount. That is my idea of it. I don't know anything about how much silver bullion there is in the world that would have to be held up.

MR. HARVEY: A question by S. A. Robinson, of New York:

"As the leading foreign bankers having branches in this country which collect the income from European investments estimate our entire foreign indebtedness at three thousand million dollars, costing us annually one hundred and thirty million dollars, please show when we received your other seven thousand million."

In the book that we are discussing, "Coin's Financial School," I state in the last chapter that we are paying England interest on five thousand million dollars of indebtedness. I do not say ten thousand million dollars, and I am not going to discuss any proposition in any other book, because it would require longer time than I have in 300 words. I want to say this: Mr. Robinson here admits that branch banks in this country of foreign banks put the amount we owe abroad at three thousand million dollars and the interest that we are paying at one hundred and thirty million annually. Now I had it two hundred million interest that we are paying, and these men who cut me down in my estimate are interested on the other side of the question. They

never went to inquiring how much money we owed until *The New York Post* pitched into "Coin's Financial School" on that proposition. The lesson to learn from that is this: That we must pay Europe one hundred and thirty million dollars annually in interest, payable in gold—three times as much gold as we produce in this country. A debtor nation that owes $130,000,000 annually in interest to a foreign nation, if it won't put silver in competition with gold so as to buy that gold cheaper, is working directly against its own interest and in the interest of that foreign nation to which the gold is due. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr: A question from Mr. F. H. McKee, of Bozeman, Montana:

"Is there gold enough in existence to do the money work of the whole world, without increasing, to a perilous degree, that so-called enlightened method, the credit system? If the gold is not sufficient, what would you use to supplement it?"

My answer is that there is an abundance of gold used in the manner in which it is being used to sustain the credits of the world. You must not imagine under our plan, or my plan, that I have been discussing here, we do not use any silver bullion for settling balances and for the basis of credit in the world. It can all be used, every dollar of it, just as it has always been, for what it is worth in bullion—that is all it is in international matters, never has been from the foundation of the world down, never has had any other value but bullion value in settlement and as basis of credit between nations, always had that and no other value. We shipped thirty-seven million of it out of this country last year, as Mr. Harvey read you himself, that is at the bullion

price; it helped to pay our debts the same as wheat or anything else would; if we had sent gold it would have paid the same, and both of them will pay what they were worth; they have always done that, and no system you can adopt will make them bring more than they are worth. (Applause.)

MR. HARVEY: A question from L. G. Powers, of Minnesota:

"As Americans are famous for making good bargains, buying in the best markets, and borrowing at lowest rates of interest, and only owe for what they have had, and as the property bonded for foreign debts remains in this country, under our laws and paying taxes, how can our foreign indebtedness be a curse?"

It is a curse in this: First, no man can do business on borrowed capital through a long period without failing. Second, it is utterly impossible for a nation to be prosperous and stay largely in debt and pay interest to foreign nations. The amount paid saps the vitality of the debtor nation. If we are paying Europe $200,000-000 annually in gold, how do we pay it? We send them all the gold that we produce, about $40,000,000; we have a balance of trade in our favor with Europe of $100,000,000, that is we ship them more than they do to us, they must pay us $100,000,000; they get that on the debt instead of it coming to us to do us some good, we don't get it at all; that goes also on the interest.

They get all our gold and all our products, and we still owe them $60,000,000. How do we pay it? We draw on our reserve of gold—"shipping gold from New York" means that we are paying that $60,000,000 when you hear of gold being shipped from New York. The day comes when a debtor will get deeper and deeper into the mire and he cannot pay at all.

Now one word more. When in sending our products to Europe to help pay this borrowed money, we sent $37,000,000 at the bullion price of silver to pay that much debt, if we had free coinage of silver we would have $74,000,000 that we would send. And when we send wheat as now at sixty cents, under free coinage we would send it at $1.20, and we could wipe out that debt and put the country on a prosperous basis. (Applause.)

END OF DEBATE.

SUMMARY BY ROSWELL G. HORR.

THE object of this debate was to determine if it would be wise for our nation to throw open its mints to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 when the civilized nations of the world refuse to join in such action. My opponent proposed to prove that such course is advisable, and undertook to do it on the lines laid down in "Coin's Financial School."

I denied the advisability of such action, and attacked the teachings of that book from the title-page to its close. The debate is finished, and how does the case stand?

Mr. Harvey admits that the book is pure fiction.

He repudiates its motto by declaring that it does not mean what it says.

His statement that primary money only is the measure of value he has not even attempted to sustain, though his proof has been called for repeatedly.

His statement that the people of the 15th and 16th centuries were in the most "degraded condition of serfdom and slavery," on account of the lack of metallic money, has been completely demolished.

He based his whole argument on the proposition that the silver dollar was in 1792 made the only unit or measure of value. I have shown conclusively that our forefathers attempted to establish bimetallism and provided for two units of value, one of gold and one of silver, always naming gold first, and that up to 1834

the silver standard alone was used. That after that the gold standard came into use, and that since that the silver dollar has never for a day been used as the measure of values in the United States.

No nation has ever succeeded in actually using two standards at the same time.

Mr. Harvey next based his case upon the assumption that the law of 1873 was a crime, and stated that it had its origin in fraud and its birth through bribery and corruption. He planted himself upon four propositions to prove his case:

First, he claimed that the Congress of the United States was purchased; that the passage of the bill was procured by the money of capitalists of this and other nations.

Secondly, he stated that the bill passed both houses all right, and was changed by some clerk in its enrollment.

He next claimed that it was not changed by a clerk, but that the dirty work was done in conference committee.

He then showed that none of his other statements are true, but that the work was done by passing a "substitute bill."

He introduced no evidence in support of either proposition, and he stands convicted of making every one of those charges without any proof that would be received in an ordinary court of justice.

If the Congress of the United States was bribed to pass a bad bill, then the bill must have first passed in bad shape. Now if that be true, then there would be no need of a clerk to do the dirty work. If it was done by the enrolling clerk, then it follows that Congress passed

the bill as it ought to have been, and consequently they could not have done what he says they were bribed to do. Again: If Congress passed the bill all right, and the enrolling clerk enrolled it correctly, then the bribery could apply only to the members of the Conference Committee.

All these villainies are then abandoned when he claims that the whole thing was accomplished by means of a "substitute bill."

He introduced no evidence in support of any one of these positions. Thus he stands convicted by his own statements of an effort to deceive the people.

I submit that such conflicting allegations demonstrate beyond a question that Mr. Harvey has attempted to sustain his position in regard to the law of 1873 by pure fiction and without calling to his aid a single established fact. It is conclusive that if he had proof of any one of his four propositions, he never would have introduced the other three. It is useless then to spend more words upon a matter which is manifestly so absurd.

Mr. Harvey's statement that free coinage creates "unlimited demand," is not true, because there can be an unlimited demand for no human productions.

His assertion that the option of the debtor to pay in either metal causes the cheaper metal to be used, is true. But such option does not restore its relative commercial value. On the contrary, it drives the dearer metal out of use, just as it has done in Mexico and other countries where the cheaper metal is to-day the sole currency, and is not increased in value one iota.

Another doctrine of Mr. Harvey is that by the free coinage of silver in this country upon the old ratio of

16 to 1, the old price of silver, as compared with gold, will be restored.

If it will restore the value of silver, it will not increase prices. He proposes to raise prices by diminishing the value of the unit with which prices are measured. Both results cannot follow.

Mr. Harvey fails entirely to prove that the use of one metal as the measure of value is an experiment. History proves that the use of a single standard is the only means by which both metals can be kept in circulation. It is the only way to secure a stable measure of values and to maintain practical bimetallism. It is based on scientific principles, and wherever attempts have been made to use both, the cheaper has always driven the dearer out of circulation, which has resulted in practical monometallism—always leaving the cheaper metal only in use.

The gold unit is not responsible for the fall in prices. The prices of labor and property, when taken together, have not declined.

It is not true that a fall in prices, when brought about by natural causes, benefits only the money-lender. Such cheapening of products benefits all who consume what they do not produce.

Mr. Harvey utterly failed to show a fall in the price of a single article which is not fully accounted for by cheaper cost of production, improved transportation, or increased supply.

He bases his contention on the assumption that gold has appreciated. As gold measures the value of commodities, wages and land, so wages, lands and commodities measure the value of gold. Commodities have fallen eight per cent, wages have increased fifty-eight

per cent, and lands have increased ninety per cent in value since 1860, when Mr. Harvey contends we were on a bimetallic basis. These facts utterly annihilate the claim that gold has appreciated.

During the discussion Mr. Harvey cites Roman history with its many evils. But he inadvertently makes an admission as to the great value of banking facilities which refutes all his other assertions against such systems. After portraying the bad conditions existing in the Roman empire, he says:

"It is a significant coincidence that the first glimmer of light only came with the invention of bills of exchange and paper substitutes, through which the scanty stock of the precious metals was increased in efficiency." He said that, in connection with a statement that at that time the metallic money of the Roman Empire had shrunken from eighteen hundred million to two hundred million. Strange it did not occur to him that this is an entire "give away" of his whole rant and fustian against banks! It would seem from his own statement that the few devices which were in use at that time, and which took the place of metallic money, did wonders for the business of the world. What then can we expect from the systems of banking of the present day, which multiply more than a thousand times the facilities for doing business which were known to the people of that age?

This admission alone saves me from using another word in defense of the banking systems of the present century.

Correctly analyzed, the financial condition of this country has improved immensely during the last twenty-five years—in the face of the charges made to the contrary by Mr. Harvey.

The condition of the masses of the people in the United States has improved more rapidly since 1873 than during any similar number of years since the nation was born. Indeed the improvement has been far greater than that of any other nation on the face of the earth during an equal number of years, at any period in the world's history, as Mulhall has conclusively shown.

Mr. Harvey in this debate, as in "Coin's Financial School," misleads people by partial statements which lead to false conclusions, when the whole statement would have been perfectly clear to any one.

His statement in reference to the banks of Chicago, and the amount of taxes they paid, is a good illustration of his methods. He uses a partial statement, well knowing that a full statement would have disproved his contention

Mr. Harvey quotes the European geologist Suess to show that the world can produce only about as much gold as is required for consumption each year outside of coinage. He conceals the fact that Suess wrote his essay several years ago, and that the production and coinage of gold in the last three years proves absolutely that Suess was entirely wrong. The facts are that during the last three years the world has produced $470,000,000 of gold, and during those years it has coined, exclusive of re-coinage, over $380,000,000. Mr. Harvey should have known these facts. Why did he quote Suess when he should have known that the actual facts proved the statement of Suess to be false?

Mr. Harvey endeavored to prove decreasing wages in the United States since 1873. He introduced only one statement in support of his position; that was the evi-

dence of a single man for one trade in the city of Omaha. On the other hand, to prove that they are advancing, I introduced the investigation of the United States Commissioner of Labor, and Mulhall, who show that the average annual wages in manufacturing industries have risen from \$288 in 1870, to \$569 for each person in 1890.

Unable to produce any table of wages that shows a fall since 1870, Mr. Harvey in the latter part of his debate tries to show the falsity of my position that in fixing the original measure of value human toil was largely taken into calculation. Did he succeed? No.

Mr. Harvey called attention to the increase of crime in the United States, and attributes it to silver legislation. Crime does bear some relation to prosperity, but far more to other causes, which Mr. Harvey ought to know.

He repeatedly tried in his book and during this debate to create a wrong impression by quoting a part of a statute, and then leaving off that portion which would show that his first statement was utterly untrue. The records of this debate convict him of such methods.

Mr. Harvey has felt called upon to vilify all the better elements of society, and has attempted to prove that bribery, corruption and fraud have become habitual in this nation. He has hardly been able to find a decent man (except himself) within the entire United States.

I submit that a cause which relies for its strength upon the wholesale vilification of our best citizens must be hopelessly weak and entirely bad.

During this debate Mr. Harvey frequently put me off with the statement that during the discussion he would

satisfactorily answer my objections, and then failed to mention that part of the subject again. Such failure is complete proof that he could not make successful answer.

During the fifth day of the debate Mr. Harvey challenged me to name more than the one error in his book which I had pointed out and which he admitted. On the 6th day I pointed out eight glaring misstatements, none of which he successfully denied.

Mr. Harvey gave the foreign indebtedness of this country as more than three times the real amount. He has been repeatedly called upon to tell when and how that vast sum reached us. No such enormous amount could have come without some record of the transaction. He has utterly failed to account for the arrival of this vast sum; which is a confession that his statement is groundless and only used to misrepresent the condition of his country. His entire table of debts is composed of a doubling up of real debts, and is a slander on the actual condition of the American people.

Mr. Harvey virtually admits that the action which he proposes will put this nation on a silver basis and drive gold out of this country. His statement that the gold dollar should be cut down until its value be no more than the commercial value of the silver in the standard dollar, is a complete admission of this point. Hence I have a right to assume that his plan contemplates such a result.

I showed conclusively that this would work injury to seventeen million people who work for wages. I also showed that the injury would extend to all pensioners, savings and other bank depositors, and the holders of insurance policies, aggregating twelve million peo-

ple, and to every person in the United States who has any money except gold coin. What has Mr. Harvey said to disprove my statements? Not one word. On the contrary, he has shown that benefits will come to no people except silver-mine owners and insolvent debtors.

Mr. Harvey said nothing to offset my proposition that such action would destroy the credit of our people and lead to business disaster in every community in the United States. Good money may rightly be called the life-blood of the nation, but credit is the atmosphere of business life. The perfection of credit is the glory of modern business methods. Repudiation in any form is abhorrent to honorable men. On this account the business men are almost a unit against this scheme. Go where you will, merchants, bankers, managers of great enterprises, successful farmers, intelligent mechanics and working-men, are opposed to injuring the country and themselves simply to benefit a few. I have from the beginning arraigned this scheme as being class and sectional legislation of the most obnoxious kind. What has Mr. Harvey said to disprove my statements? Absolutely nothing.

I submit to the people of this republic that they should never permit threats of revolution to induce them to adopt wholesale repudiation. The civilized world is clearly on my side of this issue. I protest against any attempt to lead this republic into the camp of the half-civilized and barbarous nations of the world. Let us rather remain and work in harmony with people who have large experience and sound business sense.

SUMMARY BY W. H. HARVEY.

The debate settles, in my judgment, the following propositions:

1. That gold and silver is the money of the constitution. Mr. Horr did not controvert this, and I left it with Daniel Webster's statement to that effect. The main strength underlying this proposition is a knowledge of the merits of bimetallism, as disclosed by the whole debate. As token money silver performs none of the functions intended by the constitution. Since this debate the press dispatches report the Supreme Court of Ohio as deciding that a municipality cannot issue bonds payable in gold alone; that such bonds should be payable in either gold or silver. If that court has done so, it has clearly decided rightly. There is no doubt in my mind but that the United States Supreme Court would have decided unconstitutional the act of 1873 if it had been sooner understood as a practical business proposition that that act in effect had destroyed the function of money residing in silver. The circulation of that metal as token money is wherein it has worked a deception. What the United States Supreme Court would do now is more doubtful, as I am inclined to believe that they are, as a whole, as much under the influence of the bondholders as the Supreme Court of 1860 was under the influence of the slaveholders. A test case would now probably result in a Dred Scott deci-

sion. I do not mean to express prejudice, but in view of the events of the last two years cannot help believe that official despotism has already set in and that most of our public officials are now unconsciously the willing servants of the money-lending power. If a majority of the Supreme Court are thus infected, as I fear, it could not take the broad statesmanship view of this question required.

2. That the silver dollar was the unit of value in our coinage system fixed by the act of 1792. Mr. Horr admits this. See pages 59 and 61, official report.

3. That silver and gold both were the measures of value of all other property till 1873, and the debtor had a right to pay in either metal. See Mr. Horr's answer to Mr. Motsinger on page 100.

4. That the act of 1873 was surreptitiously passed. After reading the debate on this subject, one will turn back to page 93 and read there with surprise the following language used by Mr. Horr when introducing this topic:

"I propose to show you during this discussion that no law has ever been passed by the American Congress which was freer from taint, which was more carefully examined, and which was more completely and fully understood, than the law of 1873."

When one considers that the people were deprived of one-half their primary money without their knowledge or consent, in this, a republican form of government, one can better understand the unjust and immoral position taken by the monometallists, who have since stubbornly refused to allow the people to pass a verdict upon this question. What Garfield, Blaine and others said upon this subject will be found in the congressional

records during the discussions, to which my other references given in debate will direct the reader. A letter from ex-Attorney-General Pierrepont, under President Grant, to the Hon. George Merrick, Denver, Col., stating that General Grant told him that he was deceived by the act of 1873, is in my possession, and I will cause it to be printed and get general circulation.

5. That for all time of which we have a knowledge gold and silver were treated equally as money; both had a right to enter the mints in all the countries of the world until 1816, when England closed her mints to silver, and 1873-4, when the United States, Germany, France and the Latin Union followed. And, until 1873-4, the commercial value of the two metals was substantially at a parity with the legal ratio. That this condition made both metals available for use as primary money, and the demand for primary money was relieved by the volume of both metals.

6. That prices of all property are now measured in gold alone and are substantially at the present time one-half what they would be under the bimetallic system.

Mr. Horr frequently in debate substantially makes this admission.

7. That there were $143,000,000 in silver coined at our mints prior to 1873, all of which coined prior to 1853 was primary money, and since 1853 the silver dollars were primary money, and by virtue of the right of silver to be coined into primary money through the medium of silver dollars the whole volume of the silver supply was behind our monetary system, was exerting its influence as a measure of value, and stood ready to be coined and to share equally with gold the demand

for money. That all the silver coined since February 12, 1873, has been token money, representing gold; is not exerting an influence as a measure of values; and is not performing the functions of primary money.

8. I believe those who read and carefully digest the debate will conclude that I have made good all the propositions set forth in my opening statement. That Mr. Horr found no errors in "Coin's Financial School" except the statement on page 9, where it stated that the silver coined prior to 1873 was $105,000,000, which we both agreed should read $143,000,000. This is not an error affecting the merits of the book or the principle involved, and to have stated it at $143,000,000 would have been more to the interest of my cause than stating it at $105,000,000.

NOTES ON THE DEBATE.

Mr. Horr stated that Jefferson did not stop the coinage of silver dollars in 1806, and direct that all silver seeking the mints be coined into 50-cent pieces and less, because of the scarcity of small money, as stated in the "School," but virtually receded from this claim on page 144. The exportation of silver dollars should have also been coupled by me with this statement in the "School." The reason for this exportation was not, however, on account of a premium on silver over gold, but because our silver dollars circulated as money in other nations, where their familiarity with the dollar would cause it to do so, whereas they were not familiar with our fractional coins, and thus the latter more readily stayed with us.

Mr. Horr said that when gold or silver was the unit the quantity in a dollar could not be worth either more

or less than a dollar, more or less than itself, and criticised my statement in the "School" that it could be worth more. I passed it at the time, as I did many other things that had no substantial bearing on the subject under discussion. I refer him now to recent market quotations in New York, when gold bullion was selling at a small premium, which was accounted for at the time as purchases made by a gold syndicate to prevent gold from seeking the mints. I also refer him to the silver unit I gave him, the old-coin dealers' quotation on which is $7.

Mr. Horr's frequent references to a change in the ratio prior to the formation of this government is answered by this: That these changes were not to make less money, but to make more money. In no instance is it known that silver was disturbed by increasing the size of the coins. These changes were made in the gold coins, and were made to make more money. When these changes were made in the legal ratio the commercial ratio soon conformed to the legal ratio.

If Mr. Horr had followed me in the logical arrangement of the debate as indicated by the book we were discussing, I would have been enabled to furnish data more fully justifying points in the "School" attacked by him. And I had so intended, but after the discussion of the crime of 1873 he seemed to wholly abandon the regular order of debate, and went to all parts of the "School," and at one time went to another book I had written ("Up To Date"), and hurled propositions at me that were clearly out of the regular order of the debate. This required me to use many words in the brief answers that I made to him. I did so because I did not want his statements to go wholly unanswered at

the time, and risk later an opportunity to answer him fully. I would, however, have answered all of them fully, as I did some of them afterward, if he had let them come in their proper order. One of these topics was debts. The reader knows how I abbreviated my answer. I can only say now that it is admitted by the other side that our long-time debts, including national, state, municipal, corporate, and including farm and home mortgages, amount in round figures to $20,000,000,000. It is also admitted that this does not include current business accounts and notes, nor the enormous sum that hangs over the army of debtors who have gone out of business since the repeal of the last bankrupt law, and that may still be within the statute of limitations. Neither does it include debts due from individual to individual that are not on record, and that cannot be classed as debts coming under the head of business or traders' debts. Nor does it include debts coming under the following heads:

Pawnbrokers, chattel mortgages, partial-payment sales, maritime debts, overdrafts, judgments and taxes.

If I had had time in the debate I would have justified by detail and with authorities the $40,000,000,000 at which I had estimated the aggregate indebtedness of the people of the United States.

The great danger in relying on bank credit to make up for us the insufficient supply of money, aside from the heavy tax, approximately $200,000,000 annually, on the people, is the power of the banking fraternity controlling this credit system to bring on panics by shutting off this supply at pleasure, as they did in 1857, 1873, and notably in 1893, when they used it to assist Mr. Cleveland in what they called "teaching the people an object lesson."

A NEW CIVILIZATION.

And now, excepting 300 words I shall use to reply to Mr. Horr's summary, I am closing this debate. The object sought by discussing questions affecting the welfare of the human race is to see wherein we can advance the general condition of the people and to detect errors in civilization.

The world, time out of mind, has had business panics, and most men's and women's lives have been full of trouble in acquiring the necessities and comforts of life. That our present civilization has not removed the possibility of these recurring panics, and that to a large majority of the people on this earth their almost exclusive attention and labors are given to acquiring a living, with, in most instances, indifferent and discouraging results, will be admitted by every one.

It was once supposed that labor-saving improvements and inventions would lessen the necessary toil of man, and were a promise of a day to come when with little labor all would be provided for, and humanity as a whole would be benefited. Has it had that result? All will answer that it has not. The lines of demarkation between the rich and the poor are more marked than ever, and the percentage of people who devote all their time to a struggle for existence is greater now than at any other time known to modern history. This will not be denied by any but the selfish few, who, their wants being supplied, know nothing of the wants of others. And yet, if there were no defect in our civilization, inventions would have the effect first intended for them. We are sufficiently advanced now in this respect to provide all the people of the world with the comforts of life by one hour's work each day by each individual,

while the remaining hours not devoted to sleep would be used in the promotion of human happiness and the advancement of the human race. That the passageway to a new era is blocked by a defect in our civilization will readily be recognized.

OBSTACLES IN THE WAY.

In my judgment the discussion of this financial subject can be made to remove the obstacles in the way, and with their removal will come discoveries that will lift the human race to a higher plane not now dreamed of.

The first obstacle in the way is selfishness. The promotion of self and personal interest at the expense of others pervades nearly the whole of mankind. As a natural result we are in the midst of a commercial age. Man's object in life is commerce—the acquisition of property. Hence property has come to be, in our laws, our habits and our morals, the thing of first importance.

Under such teachings we can see men and women suffer from hunger and pass them by without concern. Even little children will thus suffer without attracting public notice. A little boy was found under one of the bridges in Chicago the other day dying from starvation. The news found its way into the newspapers in a few lines. If the bridge had burned down under which he was dying it would have furnished a news item regarded as of much greater importance.

Thus we are in a commercial age, where inventions, education and all forms of human skill and ingenuity are made to promote the personal ends of men or combinations of men. Such an age promotes selfishness in

all things. It follows that it is not only lawful but desirable to monopolize to one's self property of any and all kinds, no matter how unnecessary it may be in promoting the real comforts of the person in possession. In all such instances it is held in utter disregard to the discomfiture or wants of others. To own a farm which one with reasonable assistance can till and beautify, make grand and refined with the handiwork of art and genius, is the civilization of humanity. To own thousands of acres, as does Lord Scully in this state, inhabited by tenants whose labor supports him in riotous living, is a law born of property interests and not of humanity.

It is this era of selfishness that made it possible for selfish men, wise in their own interest, to demonetize silver and increase the value of their holdings as measured in other people's property. And, as money is a thing every one must have, these dealers in money have thus been enabled to mortgage the producers of the world to them, which by its own self-operation will bring on a crisis. If the people will act unselfishly intelligent in this crisis we will learn secrets in the science of civilization heretofore hidden from us that will result in the dawn of a new era in the history of the world, and the passing from the present crude and commercial age into a newer and brighter civilization beyond.

REJOINDER BY MR. HORR.

I STATED that when either a gold or a silver unit is being used as a measure of value, the one so used can never be above or below par. When one is quoted at a premium it is never in actual use, but is measured by the other which is in use. This is self-evident.

Mr. Harvey took two days to discuss a crime which never existed, but had no time to defend many errors in his book repeatedly pointed out, and which he promised to explain later. He now tells what wonders he would have done had he not been driven from his essays, which he calls his "regular order."

While preparing his summary it occurred to him that there is one honorable body in the United States which he had not vilified, the Supreme Court. Hence he goes out of his way to slander that tribunal, bent upon his general plan to prove that there is nothing but rottenness in this republic.

Nowhere, in debate or summary, has he shown the advisability of this nation freely coining silver at 16 to 1, nor can he do it.

His summary, like his debate, attempts to disparage honest industry, thrift, and solvency. His whole system is at war with the best achievements of civilization, and clearly aims at the destruction of law, individual development, and social order, if need be, through revolution.

His whole case rests on an indictment against hu-

manity, and he seems unable to detect anything but bad odors in a world full of sweet fragrance. Out upon such wicked misrepresentation!

I have shown that Mr. Harvey is devoting his life to deceiving the people, and that such boys as "Coin" are fitly described in Psalm lviii. 3:—

"They go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies."

REJOINDER BY MR. HARVEY.

I SUPPORTED my proposition that primary money only is the measure of values, as will appear on pages 269, 270 and 276, as now published in the official report.

I made no statement as to the condition of the people in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. I read a statement from the report of the monetary commission of 1876 to show what the preface in the "School" was quoted from. More recent history was of more information to the people. If I had seen fit to defend the report my defense would have been complete.

Mr. Horr shows that he does not yet know what bimetallism is. The cheaper metal mostly in use does not mean monometallism. Because a metal is not actually and constantly in circulation does not mean that it is not regulating our currency. If he were right in that, we are now on a paper basis, for gold is not in actual circulation, not as much so as silver was from 1834 to 1862.

He is exceedingly mixed as to the order in which I presented the crime of 1873. My claim was that the bill was surreptitiously passed, not that any one was bribed. This I fully sustained, so strongly that no one can reasonably doubt there was corruption.

His eight-per-cent fall in prices, is 1891 (date of Aldrich report) compared with 1860. The prices of 1872 are the proper comparison; prices have also fallen nine per cent since 1891.

The book by Suess was written in 1891, and the reader by turning to pages 99 and 190 of the book on Coinage Laws and Statistics will get the answer to his $380,000,000 gold coinage statement. His statement is not true. Couple also with this the further fact that a large percentage of the gold used in the arts is gold coins.

I now submit the whole controversy to the intelligence of the American people.

THE END.

INDEX.

This is the only official and authorized report of our debate.

Roswell G. Horr

William H. Harvey

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

FEB 24 1968 6 3	
REC'D LD	FEB 15 '68 -8 AM

LD 21A–45m-9,'67
(H5067s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

Ord. 13–75m-11,'46(A1661s8)46

M308814